



**AN INTRODUCTION  
TO  
CHHANDOGYA BHASHYA**

by

*Shri Swami Maheshananda Giri Maharaj*

Mahamandaleshvar

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface	3
The place of Chāndogya in the Veda	1
The place of Śaṅkara in the Vaidika tradition	2
A harmonious view of life	3
Analysis of the contents of the texts : Aum	7
The celestial fight	7
Names of Ṛṣis	8
The story of Uṣasti	11
Sāman	12
Heptad Meditations	13
Three divisions of meditators	14
Paramahansa saṁnyāsa	15
Madhu Vidyā	18
Śāṇḍilya Vidyā	19
Jivana Yajña : the story of Kṛṣṇa	20
Saṁvarga Vidyā	23
Satyakāma's maternal parentage : A criticism	27
Agni Vidyā	29
The meaning of Satyakāma's life	32
Sacrifice to acquire wealth	33
Meditations on Five Fires	33
Vaiśvānara Vidyā	37
Śvetaketu-Vidyā-Sad-Vidyā	39
Food	41
Sleep	42
'Who is the Soul ?' The same light as you	43
Bhūmā	46
The heart-ākāśa	52
Brahmacarya	54
Prajāpati-Vidyā	56



## P R E F A C E

Vedānta is the cream of philosophy. The name Vedānta means 'the purpose of the Veda'. The portions of the Veda which present *the* purpose, are called the Upaniṣads. Though there are over a score of works going under that name, it is conventionally and traditionally understood that only sixteen of them are true Vaidika-upaniṣads. Out of these, only ten have had the gracious privilege of being commented upon by the great Śāṅkara. The Chāndogya-upaniṣad is such a one, treating most comprehensively all the aspects of religious metaphysics. The Mahesh Research Institute has published the text with its Śāṅkarabhāṣya, Ānanda Giri's gloss, and two other commentaries, penned by Narendra purī and Abhinava Nārāyaṇānandendra Saraswatī. The pontiff of the Dakṣiṇāmūrti maṭha (Varāṇasi) and the founder president of the Institute, Swāmī Maheśānanda Giri Mahārāja, Mahāmaṇḍaleśvara, has been kind enough to bedeck the volume with a masterly introduction. As we found the introduction is itself an informative and critical assessment of the Bhāṣya and Tīkās, logically refuting modern accusations on Vedānta and giving innumerable directives to a research scholar, we decided to publish it as a separate booklet.

The tradition of Vedānta has its source in Lord Śrī Dakṣiṇāmūrti who imparted the knowledge to the four kumars, simply by the cinmudrā. This mauna-vyākhyā (silent discourse) when found too subtle, Śāṅkara's incarnation became necessary, which put into words, the Wordless. Thus the tradition after Śrī Śāṅkara has been based on verbal teaching instead of the silent one.

The cinmudrā is formed by drawing the right fore-finger away from its neighbouring three upright fingers and joining its tip with that of the thumb. The three upright fingers represent the three states of being—the waking, dream and deep sleep—each of them composed of the three principles (represented by the digits) of the enjoyed, enjoyer and enjoyment. The fore finger symbolizes the individual self and the thumb, the Supreme one. The unity of the individual, disassociated with the states, and the Supreme is meaning of this mudrā. It has been named thus because it gives the knowledge of the cinmātra, consciousness itself. The said mudrā is the symbol of the Supreme Being palpable to Visual perception as the praṇava (ॐ) is to the auditory.

The flow of time brought the age of Kali, all set for an extinction of the Vaidika Dharma. Buddhism became the major opponent and the

populace under its swing became dryly logical in its intellectual and spiritual standards. Therefore the re-establishment of the Vaidika tradition needed a strong personality resplendent with wisdom and the tact of presenting the truth in an agreeable manner with patience to wait for results after a thorough promulgation of the tenets. All this found place in the person of Śrī Śaṅkara Bhagavatpāda—the avatāra for modern times.

Till the age of Kali began, the ācāryas of Vedānta were in a parental succession. For example Vaśiṣṭha, Śakti, Parāśara, Vyāsa and Śuka were all related parentally. But this system, which had remained unsoiled for so long a period because of the integrity of the people, could no longer be continued, for the circumstances were such that nepotism could not be abated. So the ācāryas felt the necessity of starting a teacher-disciple succession and keeping Vedānta in the hands of saṁnyāsins who, having left all their relatives lived in a heterogeneous society where only merit becomes *the* factor deciding succession. Thus the leadership came to Śrī Gauḍapāda, the author of the Māṇḍūkya kārikās, the pioneer attempt to present Vedānta in a logical manner. Ācārya Śaṅkara says of him :

प्रमथ्य वज्रोपमयुक्तिसम्भूतैः श्रुतेररातीञ्जितशो वचोऽसिभिः ।

ररक्ष वेदार्थनिधिं विशालधीः नमो यतीन्द्राय गुरोर्गरीयसे ॥ (उप० सा० १८.२)

Gauḍapāda's out-look was truly a revolutionary change in attitude and was the seed that sprouted in the form of Śaṅkara, in the second generation after him. Govindapāda, a disciple of Gauḍapāda was Śaṅkara's teacher.

The wide popularity of Vedānta acquired by the forceful presentation of Śaṅkara made it necessary to appoint many ācāryas throughout the country. Thus were the mathas and pīṭhas established all over the land to serve as institutions devoted to the study and preaching of advaita respectively. Śaṅkara's chief disciples were Padmapāda, Hastāmalaka, Toṭaka and the great Vārtikakāra Sureśvara. In the same tradition followed Sarvajñātmā, Prakāśātmā, Anubhūtiśvarūpa, Vidyāraṇya and later Madhusūdana and Brahmānanda Sarasvatī. Since study requires stability and application, the situations of the mathas were fixed. The pīṭhas were mobile bodies formed by a number of illustrious monks and scholars, led by an ācārya. As 'the conquest of India was the conquest of culture by those who lacked it,' many pīṭhas, especially in the North, were lost, yet few managed to survive and even flourish.

One such blessed pīṭha that has to this day preserved the traditions of the Ācārya, is the Śrī Dakṣiṇāmūrti Pīṭha, a tradition that is vital and significant in its very name. The pīṭha has zealously guarded the intellectual and emotional purity of advaita as found in the works of Śaṅkara, Padmapāda and Sureśvara. It has stuck to the worship of Śrī Dakṣiṇāmūrti as an almost

solitary exception in the entire expanse of the North. When roaming about in large numbers became difficult, the ācāryas of the Pīṭha spent most of their time in a garden in the vicinity of Lord Viśvanātha in Vārāṇasī. There the Lord used to be worshipped under a banyan tree in a śiva-liṅga. Later a marble image of Śrī Medhā-Dakṣiṇamūrti was installed. In recent years, an enlarged shrine was constructed and a new image consecrated. Renunciation, humility and deep scholarship have been the most important qualities of the ācāryas of the pīṭha. Devotion to the Lord, Guru and the scriptures is naturally practised. Slowly the pīṭha also developed a maṭha—a residential school for saṁnyāsins and students. To-day it is the most prestigious post-graduate college in the city.

When Indraprastha (Delhi) regained its glory, becoming the centre of all activities after independence, the then Pīṭhācārya Swāmī Nṛsiṁha Giri Mahārāja Mahāmaṇḍaleśvara, also the ācārya of the Nirañjanī Akhādā, concentrated his attempts to establish the Vaidika tradition in the ancient city. As a result, in 1951, the Śrī Viśvanātha Saṁnyasa Āśrama was established. Later a Saṁskṛta School and post-graduate College was also instituted. Though centres for study and preaching were set up, one for sādhanā was lacking. Therefore in 1962 the then Ācārya Mahāmaṇḍaleśvara Swāmī Maheśānanda Giri Mahārāja set up an āśrama in Mount Ābū with the explicit purpose of the training of the monks in sādhanā. In this age when more than ever the tide of materialism has gathered momentum threatening to sweep away humanity off its spiritual footing, there still is a hope that at least few sincerely thoughtful minds will see and understand the Truth if presented in the proper light. The era of intellectualism needs satisfaction of the reasoning power before approaching God. It is the firm conviction of the said Svāmījī that Śaṅkara's presentation of the Truth is *the* answer to the modern question of spiritual identity. Accordingly, Svāmījī has established the Mahesh Research Institute in Mount Ābū and Vārāṇasī. The aim of the Institute is to print and publish all the great master-pieces of Śaṅkara-Vedānta with all the serious commentaries available in print or manuscript. First of all Śrī Śaṅkara's works have been taken up. Twelve prakaraṇas with illustrious commentaries of Padmapāda, Vidyāraṇya and Madhusūdana have been published in the first volume. Eight upaniṣads with their Bhāṣyas and their tikās were presented in the second volume. The gloss of Anubhūtiśvarūpa on the Māṇḍūkyakārikā-Bhāṣya has been published for the first time in that volume. The third volume comprises of the Chāndogya-upaniṣad, its bhāṣya, Ānandagiri's gloss, Narendrapurī's Ṭippanam and Abhinava Nārāyaṇānandendra's commentary on the last three chapters. The second commentary was hitherto unpublished.

The Chāndogya upaniṣad is the most important text of Vedānta after the Bṛahadāraṇyaka upaniṣad. In addition to the intellectual portion of advaita, the upasana or the emotional portion is dealt with most exhaustively, making Chāndogya difficult to understand even by scholars. In fact, advaita has its culmination in experience, thus making it unintelligible to mere bookish scholars. The Bhāṣya and commentaries have further widened the scope for discussion. Therefore we requested Svāmī Maheśānanda Girijī to give us a comprehensive, detailed and critical introduction to the volume, which he has benignly accepted. That introduction has been published as an independent booklet.

Svāmījī is not only a past-master in advaita, but is also a scholar of modern philosophy. In his endeavour to promulgate the Truth he has given deep thought to the western views regarding the questions of philosophy. Semantics and other such *new* outlooks have been studied by him with keen interest. The totalistic attitude of science as a philosophy has been criticized by him thoroughly. In his commentary on the Svetāśvatara upaniṣad, Svāmījī has discussed in great detail the explanations from a scientific standpoint and has rejected or accepted them according to what reason allows. In other independent works such as 'Gītā praveśa' and 'Mānavatā Kī Ora', he has considered the social and other aspects of life from the viewpoint of Vedānta. The wholistic approach of Vedānta as propounded by Śaṅkara has found expression in all the works of Svāmījī. The traditional philosophical thoughts are sprinkled all over his books. In his commentary on 'Mānasollāsa', named 'Mādhurī', Svāmījī has brought out in great detail a comparison between advaita and the trika-philosophy of Śaivism. From such a pen has flowed this Introduction making it an authoritative article on the Chāndogya-literature.

The very essence of Hinduism is Brahman, the Divine Being. It is not any person or rule in particular which is its foundation, thereby making it a science of Reality rather than a religion. Thus, according to Svāmījī (p., 1) only a realized soul is a true Hindu. The complete life of a person has to be led according to the scriptures. Therefore the āśrama system encompasses the whole span of a hundred years of a man's life. Since people of all mentalities have to follow some spiritual path, even meditations like the Vāmadevopāsana which seem to be immoral, have to be developed. It must be remembered that though harmonious, Hinduism is not uniform, and this is the life force behind it. The various traditions have to be harmonized rather than adhering to any one of them, or creating a new one. This has been brought about best by Śaṅkara (p., 3). Furthermore Svāmījī declares : 'It is our challenge that apart from logic chopping, not a single spiritual fibre which has not been either supported or contradicted by Śaṅkara can be shown in the works of these

(Rāmānuja, Vallabha, the moderners etc.) Commentators, (p., 4). And he goes on to prove how.

In the major portion of the Introduction, the topics as discussed in the texts of the Upaniṣad, Bhāṣya, Narendrapuri's Tippanam, Ānandagiri's and Abhinava Nārāyaṇānandendra's Tikas are presented as a r'esume'. Occasionally Svāmīji has criticized some of the modern interpretations and has established the supramacy of the traditional theory. He does not, however, believe that no new contribution is possible in philosophical thought. His view is that one must attune oneself with the tradition and then apply one's mind armed with the modern arguments. Traces of such topics are seen in his attempt to compare the ancient and modern theories of creation and the establishing of interconversion of energy (p., 23). The application of theory in practice is shown where he points out the real meaning behind a sacrifice to attain wealth (p., 33). The fact that even plants experience joy is not only based on the Upaniṣad, but also on modern science (p., 43), but this is *not* to establish the truthfulness of the Upaniṣad. We also witness the light of realization focussed on topics related to the life of liberated one (pp., 7, 18, 59 etc). As the Dakṣiṇāmūrti : tradition has laid great stress on the advaita upāsanās, Svāmīji's observations are not only from an experiential standpoint, but also bear the stamp of tradition, as is quite clear in the Five Fire meditations (p., 34). The importance of tradition is felt when he informs the meaning hidden between the lines. The common meaning is superior to the derived one (p., 10), is a rule one must remember even when interpreting symbols (p., 19). The deity's coming as a dog suggests only the lowness of one's ideals and not a satire on Vaidika ritual (p., 12) since the context there is such. Further, cooked up meditations lead to no-where (p., 13). One must practise only the ordained meditations.

The subject of paramahaṃsa saṁnyāsa is discussed in great detail (p., 15). It is not only a dry logical discussion but also has a personal touch, as Svāmīji himself is a Saṁnyāsī. The question of Saṁnyāsa has acquired a gigantic dimension today because of two factors. First, the traditional saṁnyāsins are sidelining into the Smārta institution, and second, the modern mind is trying to refute the very concept of complete renunciation with all appendages. On the authority of the Upaniṣad and the Bhāṣya, both these views are found to be incorrect and the nature of a true paramahaṃsa is brought out.

The question of the identity of the Kṛṣṇa mentioned in the Upaniṣad and the famous Bhagavān of Mahābhārata, is dealt with critically (p., 21). Svāmīji seems to be of the opinion that they are one, though he does not put it in so many words.

The story of Satyakāma and its criticism by the moderners is discussed thread-bare (p., 26). Varṇa-system is the most criticized one in Indian culture today. Whether or not does birth determine varṇa is a constant question in the minds of people. Certain episodes from Vaidika and Paurāṇika literature are often quoted to support the view that qualities and actions are the determinant factors as far as varṇa goes. Satyakāma's is one such story. We have been lucky to get a most critical analysis of the subject by Svāmijī who has also used modern psychological arguments to disqualify the opponents' allegations. The real meaning behind the story is also explained (p., 32), making it clear that such stories are not for the purpose of creating interest only. The very difficult portions of meditations as well as the intellectual discussions have been explained with great pains, thereby showing the greatness of the Dakṣiṇāmūrti tradition.

We offer our humble thanks to Śrī Svāmijī for being kind enough to write such an exhaustive Introduction and pray that he may give us similar blessings for our further publications also.

S. Subrahmaṇya Śāstri

*Director*

MAHESH RESEARCH INSTITUTE



## INTRODUCTION

The Veda is the fountainhead of Hinduism, more appropriately called Brahmanism the religion of the ever expansive Divine Being, as compared to Zoroastrianism, the religion as preached by Zoroaster; Christianity, the religion as preached by Christ; Buddhism, the religion as preached by the Buddha; Jainism, the religion as preached by Jina, and so on and so forth. Brahmanism is so called because it is enunciated in the Brāhmaṇa part of the Veda, it is studied and professed by the Brāhmaṇa, its goal is the realization of Brahman, and it is devoted to Brahman. The main theme of the Veda is nothing but Brahman. The ideal Hindu is the real Brāhmaṇa, that is, who has been able to see Brahman (Divinity) as his true being. The Veda does not exhaust itself in formulating a code of conduct or catechism of faith, but leads the soul to Realization, where one is freed from the bondage of all fixed conduct or faith. Thus one can easily see that Hinduism is more a science of Reality rather than a religion as understood by non-Hindus.

### THE PLACE OF CHĀNDOGYA-UPANIṢAD IN THE VEDA

The Veda is divided into a liturgical portion called the Mantrabhāga, and another the application portion called the Brāhmaṇabhāga, which is again sub-divided into the ritualistic portion (Brāhmaṇa), the devotional and meditational portion (Āraṇyaka), and the theosophical portion (Upaniṣad). The singer of the Veda is called Chāndogya, hence his Brāhmaṇa is called the Chāndogya Brāhmaṇa, whose theosophical portion is presented here. Actually, the Sāmaveda has come down to us in three recensions : the Kauthuma, the Jaiminīya, and the Rāṇayaniya. The present Chāndogya-Upaniṣad belongs to the Kauthuma recension, contains eight chapters and is reckoned as the sixth among the eight independent Brāhmaṇas of the Sāmaveda. The theosophical portion of the Jaiminīya recension is the Kenopaniṣad.

Along with the Bṛhadāraṇyaka-Upaniṣad, Chāndogya is the most discussed Upaniṣad in the Brahma-Sūtras, and is only slightly less voluminous than Bṛhadāraṇyaka the largest Upaniṣad. The Bṛhadāraṇyaka-Upaniṣad is more theoretical, whereas the Chāndogya-Upaniṣad is more practical. The latter exhaustively deals with the various Vedic meditations, mainly due to which it is impenetrable to those who are not thoroughly saturated with the knowledge of the ritualistic portion of the Veda. It must be clearly understood that most of the Vedic meditations are based on Vedic rituals. While performing the rituals, one should meditate upon their significance. Thus a life of activity is associated with meditation as the second stage of spiritual ascent, the first being the following of ethical life along with rituals. The third stage is continuing meditative life while fathoming the nature of Reality, which leads to its apprehension leading to renunciation of all actions—external rituals, as well as internal meditations. Renunciation of all actions is necessary because the actions are prescribed for a given social

temporal and mental axis, and Reality is beyond the limitations imposed by such co-ordinates. This renunciation leads to the unbroken experience of one's own being which is nothing but Brahman. Having attained this final stage, one is free as free as God Himself, and thus becomes the beacon light of the path to Brahman for those who are still travelling on it. This, in a nut shell, is Hinduism.

#### HINDUISM : A WAY OF LIFE

One easily observes that Hinduism is a way of life rather than a set of beliefs. Being co-ordinated to conduct, a Hindu's options to choose the set of beliefs best suited to his temperament and circumstances, and tread the path accordingly, are free. This freedom being equally available to other aspirants, he is essentially sympathetic to other paths and to those who follow them. Hinduism therefore, never became, nor can it ever become an organized religion like Buddhism, Jainism, Judaism, Christianity, Islam or Sikhism. Organizations are bound to be oriented towards secular activities, which may be social, economic or political. Hinduism is not against such organizations, but finds them to be useless for a spiritual goal. The religious wars and inquisitions are historical demonstrations of the truth of Hindu's view. In spite of a thousand years' struggle with Islam and Christianity, Hinduism refused to transform itself into an organization, because to a Hindu, his spiritual freedom is much more valuable than his socio-politico-economical existence. It is this freedom that he is devoted to, rather than a mere political, social or economic freedom. One may argue against his impractical vision, but this is just a statement of fact, rather than its justification or otherwise. A Hindu's freedom of choosing his spiritual path according to his temperament is made clear in the Chāndogya-Upaniṣad in which occurs the 'Vāmadevopāsanā' which can easily be considered immoral by non-vaids (or non-Hindus). The unlimited tolerant aspect of this great religion is shown in this Upaniṣad in the 'Prajāpati-vidyā' where the demons are also instructed by the Prajāpati.

#### THE PLACE OF ŚRĪ ŚĀṆKARA IN THE VAIDĪKA TRADITION

The Veda is more a tradition than a book by one or more authors, Hence, it is impersonal by nature. Since it delves deep into the spiritual life of Man, it tries to cover every strata of humanity. There is enough philosophy and technique in it which can help the most backward ape-man, as well as the most sophisticated intellect; the one who scarcely believes in the existence of life without the body, as well as the realized soul who sees nothing but Siva everywhere. to be established in the Absolute Bliss. This range of dealing, due to the variety of levels of aspirants, has led several modern writers astray in thinking that the Veda presents contradictory theories. Long before the dawn of history, the oral tradition covered both, the letter and spirit of the Veda. It is important to note that on most topics Śāṅkara, Śrīkaṇṭha and Rāmānuja agree in the main trend. To an impartial observer their unanimity strikes far more than their differences. This does not mean that the differences are to be ignored, but what strikes most is that the differences are in the philosophical corollaries that are derived from the Veda,

rather than in the textual interpretation as such. To us, text-torturing seems more prevalent in the modern interpreters than in the ancient commentators, though it is the moderners who cry hoarse over the text-torturing of the ancients. It will be noticed in the present volume, that wherever differences existed between the great commentators, they have not only been presented, but also harmonized. It is the conviction of the editor as well as the Dakṣiṇāmūrti tradition that Śrī Śaṅkara is the only reliable guide in the avenues of the Upaniṣads. It is not a mere sentiment, but a fact that has been shown in the annotations by the editor.

The concept of uniformity and the concept of harmony are not exactly identical. The Veda presents a harmonious view of spiritual life, though, per force, not a uniform one. The moderners are misled by not differentiating the two. In harmonizing contrary views, the co-ordinates of values have first to be decided. Though all the great commentators agree that the Veda presents a harmonious view, yet they differ about the co-ordinates. We need not impute motives on the great commentators for this diversion. When it is a question of being true to the text recorded thousands of years ago, one has to depend on the traditional interpretation. The tradition, in its turn, is tinged by the views of the one who hands it down. The tinge becomes heavy in a succession of scores of teachers. So the choice should not be between free interpretation and the traditional one, but between either accepting one of the traditions that seems more suited to one's intellectual, moral and emotional state or, if possible, harmonizing the different traditions. Śrī Śaṅkara is the only commentator who has expressively harmonized all those who went before him. He had the added advantage of receiving the tradition which existed at its thinnest stream after the onslaught of Buddhism and Jainism. Though the Ālwars and the Nayanars preceded him, yet, they were digging new wells to quench their thirst for God, rather than claiming to present a traditional view. Thus, they may be able to supply independent verification of the Truth as presented by tradition, but they do not supply a traditional line of succession to support the reliability of the tradition, or otherwise. There is a gap of a thousand year or more between the ancient Hinduism and Śaṅkara. In fact, modern Hinduism is the expression of ancient Hinduism through Śaṅkara. He is the only link between the two. He has not only with great acumen, successfully presented the tradition, but has also showered on it his intellectual and experiential knowledge.

Śrī Śaṅkara was certainly the greatest religious leader that Hinduism has produced. He was one of the greatest saints and mystics of humanity. He was the crest jewel of philosophers as well as of devotees. Furthermore, he was the brightest star that shone in the galaxy of Saṅskṛta poets. His organising capacity has endowed Hinduism with a band of workers for continuous spiritual regeneration in the form of Daśanāmī order. No wonder the typical Hindu mentality considers him to be the incarnation of Śiva, who, theoretically, is never incarnated. This is a Hindu way of

saying that Śaṅkara was the greatest of the great of all time. This multi-faceted greatness tempts one to subscribe to the view that Śaṅkara has created the tradition rather than handed it down. But, one has merely to read him faithfully to see the constant references indicating his love for the tradition, and his utter humbleness before his teachers, who handed over the traditional torch to him. Such humility would not have been possible, had he been the creator of the tradition. He could easily have been another Buddha if he so wished, but he rarely, if ever demands allegiance to his view because it is his experience.

We have been studying the different commentators, such as Śrīkaṇṭha, Rāmānuja, Vallabha, Nimbārka, Baladeva, Śrīkara, Madhva and the moderners, for over fifty years now. We have seen that apart from the criticism of the Advaita-view, there is little more in the content of their traditional view that is not found in Śaṅkara, or is not just a logical corollary of what he has said. It is our challenge that apart from logic-chopping, not a single spiritual fibre, which has not been either supported or contradicted by Śaṅkara, can be shown in the works of these commentators. All the statements of the other commentators about God, are melted down in the crucible of the concept of Saṅga Brahman of Śaṅkara. The concept of Brahman of Śrīkaṇṭha and Rāmānuja is practically identical with Śaṅkara's concept of Īśvara, and they rarely try to contradict it. Similarly, Śaṅkara's concept of Virāṭ or Sūtrātman takes care of Madhva, Vallabha and others. Thus, what they contradict, is the range outside their vision. Had they been true traditionalists, they would have presented different facets of the same Truth which Śaṅkara had presented. When it comes to present a positive aspect of the spiritual Being, they have little to say, though they roar to assert what it is not. This gives the lie to their having received a different unbroken tradition. As we said earlier, it was but natural that different aspects of the Being be emphasised, but the true traditionalist that Śaṅkara was, he never criticised or disowned the views of Virāṭ, Hiraṇyagarbha or Īśvara. He rather developed complete harmony between them. Thus, without any fear of contradiction, we can say that Śaṅkara is the *Hindu tradition*. It is no wonder that Rāmānuja, Vallabha, Nimbarka, Madhva etc. never wrote extensive commentaries on all the major Upaniṣads, which are the fountain-heads of Hinduism. Had they a different tradition, they would certainly have handed it down through their commentaries. This is the reason why the philosophical and spiritual successors of Śaṅkara dealt logical blows to the views of these masters and wrote on the Brahmasūtras and the Gītā in practically every century after him, while not finding it necessary to write on the Upaniṣads. The great Vidyāraṇya of course, had to do it as a part of his magnum-opus the exhaustive comments on all the available portions of the Veda. Śaṅkarānanda, Nārāyaṇa and Upaniṣad-Brahma-Yogīndra are perhaps the only other available guides on the vast literature of the Upaniṣads. Vidyāraṇya's abridgement of the Upaniṣads in his famous 'Anubhūti-Prakāś' is a master-piece of a master craftsman.

### THE REVIVAL OF HINDUISM

The last two centuries saw a revival of Hinduisim. The negative approach found its expression in Brahma Samāja, Ārya Samāja and Prārthanā Samāja who tried to re-form Hinduism to suit the westernized conscience. The positive approach found its expression in swāmī Rāmākṛṣṇa Purī, his vocal lion Swāmī Vivekānanda, Swāmī Rāmātīrtha, Swāmī Cidghanānanda Giri, Pīṭambar Paṇḍita, Kalūlāla Sāstrī, Swāmī Dayānanda (of Bhārata Dharma Mahāmaṇḍala), Dīna Dayālu Śāstrī, Bāpaṭ Śāstrī, Ananta Kṛṣṇa Śāstrī, Swāmī Bhāratikṛṣṇa Tīrtha, Swāmī Saṅkaracaitanya Bhāratī, Swāmī Mahādevānanda (Maṇḍaleśwara), Swāmī Maheśwarānanda (Maṇḍaleśwara) and a host of others. It is clear that in the forefront have been the advaita-traditionalists who follow the great master Śrī Śaṅkara. Even a Tilaka or a Gandhī follows and accepts advaita as his creed, though he may differ in details. To our own day Swāmī Hariharānanda Saraswatī (Kara-pātrī) is an advaita follower who leads the orthodox Hindus, may they be the Śrī Vaiṣṇavas or Vaiṣṇavas. The revival has also brought about the popularization of the scriptures which has involved translations into English and other regional languages. Gaṅgānātha Jhā, Mahādeva Sāstrī, Hirianna, Rādhākṛṣṇan, Swāmī Swarūpānanda, Swāmī Mādhavānanda, Swāmī Vireśwarānanda, Swāmī Gambhīrānanda and others presented the English versions, and, it may be noted, they all followed the advaita tradition. Often a criticism is made by some people that, due to these one-sided translations, Vedānta has been wrongly identified as Advaita. But the point to be considered here is, that the field of translation and popularization was equally open to all the others, including the non-Śaṅkara Vedāntists, but they could neither take the lead, nor even follow suit afterwards. Only the Advaitists remained pioneers in this field. This was because they had a traditionalists' approach having received an unbroken tradition. They have thus fulfilled Śrī Śaṅkara's famous prophecy in Chāndogya Bhāṣya : 'वेदान्तविज्ञानपरैरेव वेदनीयं सम्प्रदायमनुसरद्भिः । तथाऽनुशासत्यद्यापि त एव नान्ये' To us, his humble followers, it is, of course, a command to live up to. The history of the last twelve centuries is a proof that his spirit still moves and has its being in the Daśanāmī order that he founded. His lay disciples, that he organized, still keep the bridge to Bliss available to those who want to tread on it. They act as torch-bearers in giving direction to those desirous of doing good to others and bringing harmony in social, economic, political and other such spheres in this creation of the Divine Being.

### THE PRESENT EDITION

The Chāndogya-upaniṣad, presented here, is the second largest of the major Upaniṣads, being but a little shorter than the Bṛhadāraṇyaka-Upaniṣad, as has been mentioned earlier. It has an extensive commentary by Śrī Śaṅkara, annotated further by Swāmī Narendra Purī. These annotations are delightfully informative, at times witty, precise and penetrative. The famous great annotator of Śaṅkara, Swāmī Ānanda Giri, follows Purī very closely, often quoting whole paragraphs from the Tīppaṇam (as Purī's commentary is called), sometimes paraphrasing them, and at times elaborating them.

But he has left out some details purposefully, since Purī is incisive in his remarks as compared to the more sober Giri for example, Saṁnyāsins having vairāgya, but without, devotion to knowledge are called 'half-saṁnyāsins' by Purī, while Giri lets them off by referring to them as vividiṣu-saṁnyāsins. We shall have occasions to point out such passages later. We may say that what 'Ratnaprabhā' is to 'Nyāyanirṇaya', or what Rāmatīrtha is to Ānanda Giri, Ānanda Giri is to Narendra Purī. Both of them were saints of the highest calibre, and their comments are full of spiritually-inspired passages. We are sure that they will illuminate by-lanes of sādhana for the keen aspirant, light thrown by them is not easy to find elsewhere.

The third annotation presented here is more theoretically oriented. The author was a scholiast, and has not only presented a fine compilation of all available interpretations of the Bhāṣya, but has also given them a logical coherence, thereby making his work a sure guide to the intricate but delicate design of the Bhāṣya. Unfortunately, he has left the first five chapters unannotated. From the benedictory verse, he seems to belong to the Dakṣiṇāmūrti tradition and his name suggests that he was associated with the Kāmakoti Pīṭha order of Indra Saraswatī. For a long time the Dakṣiṇāmūrti tradition, which was the main original current of Advaita and to which Śaṅkara belonged, was widespread in the south as well as in the north. The main emphasis of this tradition is on a meditative life of renunciation along with deep devotion to the Guru and scriptural studies. Due to the divine grace of Lord Dakṣiṇāmūrti and his 'vocal incarnation' [मुखर-दक्षिणामूर्ति] Sarvajña Śaṅkara Bhagavatpāda, even in this age of worldliness it has successfully tried to keep itself away from the lime-light of publicity and carried on the torch of austere devotion. Those who witnessed the life of Swāmī Nṛsiṃha Giri (Mahāmaṇḍaleśvara) in the twentieth century, were witnessing a miracle of this tradition. In Abhinava Nārāyaṇānandendra's commentary one can almost feel this tradition.

The last, but not the least, the annotations in the footnotes by Śrī S. Subrahmaṇyam Śāstrī, are a treat to the mind. He is one of the rare scholars of this age, who combines in himself the keenness of intellect with utter devotion to Vedāntic learning. He is simplicity incarnate, along with being a sādaka of the highest order. We are sure that he is bound to enter into the eternal Śaṅkara at the end of his present life. He has come from the Śivaloka to establish the Advaita Dharma in the present age of materialism, and is bound to return there after fulfilling his mission. Thus the present edition is not a mere collection of previous editions, but, containing as it does two original annotations, is an addition to the available Chāndogya literature, and a *must* for every Sādaka of Advaita.

#### ANALYSIS OF CONTENTS

In the introductory portion of the Upaniṣad, Śaṅkara points out the relation between the ritualistic and meditative portion, which has preceded the Upaniṣad, and the present portion of Divine knowledge. He asserts that until the dawn of knowledge, one should follow the earlier portion, and renounce it completely after the dawn.

Meditations on Brahman with form, viz. Īśwara, are prescribed in the Upaniṣad portion for those who are either unfit to grasp the unconditioned Brahman, or, though fit, are not capable of dwelling in it continuously. The moral is that once the effervescent nature of the universe is realized one should be entirely devoted to Brahman, either in its conditioned form or its unconditioned existence, renouncing all rituals with their polytheism or monotheism. As for the one to whom the knowledge has dawned, nothing else is to be done except dwelling in it and emanating it wherever he happens to exist due to the Divine Will. To the ignorant, this seems to be the Prabodha of the knower, but to him it seems to be a great play of the Lord.

#### AUM (THE FIRST CHAPTER)

The Upaniṣad starts with the meditation on AUM called a part of Udgītha in the Sāmaveda. Here Śaṅkara states that AUM is the nearest and the most pleasing name of Mahādeva, and even its mere repeating, is supremely pleasing to Him. He further asserts that this is also the best symbol of the supreme Lord. Just as there are other images (अर्च) of other divinities, Aum is the image of Paramātmā. It is to be remembered that the Śiva-Liṅga is but a three dimensional representation of Aum. The important point made out by Purī and Giri is that Aum is not merely a name but it is itself Mahādeva. This is the main reason why a Paramahansa, though not supposed to do any worship or japa of any mantra, is yet ordained to do Śivaliṅga worship and Aum-japa every day. The Upaniṣad goes on to describe how Aum is the essence of all existence. This meditation on Aum should start while one is engaged in rituals. In the editorial annotation, the rituals with which this meditation is associated, are described. He, furthermore, describes different classes of meditations which will be found useful for the spiritual aspirants. The Upaniṣad further goes on to assert that the one who performs the ritual, meditating upon Aum, with faith and concentration, achieves higher results as compared to the one who performs it without this meditation. Śaṅkara points out that a person, ignorant of the particular deity of the ritual, gets lesser result of the ritual, than the one who performs it while knowing the deity, and not that he does not get any result. Only, one ignorant of the deity should be careful not to perform the ritual before someone who has knowledge of the deity without his approval.

#### THE FIGHT BETWEEN GODS AND DEMONS

Aum can be meditated upon in the Sun or in the Prāṇa as they are its divine and human manifestations respectively. To present this fact, the Upaniṣad narrates a beautiful story. Both, Gods and demons are children of the Divine being. They eternally fight with each other. The Gods decided to win over the demons by the help of this Aum-upāsanā. As the symbolic representation of Aum, they used, one by one, the eyes, the nostrils etc. But, as the demons were able to introduce sin in all those senses, the gods were unsuccessful in completing their mission. Eventually they tried to use the clan vital as a representation of Aum. The demons could not inject sin in it. Therefore

it provides it-self to be the perfect symbol of Aum, which is sinless. With the help of this Aum upāsanā in the clan vital, the gods were able to win over the demons. The Upaniṣad declares that whoever meditates thus, is able to fulfill his desires.

Śrī Śaṅkara brings out the real significance of the story. He holds that by gods are meant the senses directed by the right and beneficial desires, whereas the demons are the senses directed by the pleasure principle. Thus the great master has given us the key to unlock innumerable stories of Indian as well as foreign mythology. By this very formula we can solve Ahuramazda-Ahriman, God-Devil and Allah-Satan equations. Further Śaṅkara points out that the fight referred to is not of any particular time, but is eternal. The purpose of such stories is to indicate the nature of virtue and vice. In the present story, the purpose is to show that the Prāṇa is the purest principle in human existence. It is pure as it did not fall prey to demonic desires.

It is further pointed out by Śaṅkara that Prajāpati is the person qualified to perform physical or mental actions independently. Virtuous and vicious actions of such a person are his children. Narendrar Purī considers attachment to objects of senses as the real vice leading to all others, and unattachment to sensuous enjoyment along with equanimity in joy and sorrow, as the real virtue. Thus does he place ethics on a very firm foundation of experience and as rationality. It is interesting to note that Ānanda Giri differs from him about this definition. He asserts that enjoying by the senses constitutes vice, and abstaining from it constitutes virtue. Purī's interpretation is however, supported by Śaṅkara, because he has said that due to the pride, the senses had in doing virtuous actions, their fall took place. Thus it stands justified that pride goeth before it falls. One is able to avoid vice only if he remains unattached even to his virtuous actions, and is humble enough not to assert them as exclusively his own.

The purity of Prāṇa is further attributed, by Śaṅkara, to its giving nourishment to all (सर्वार्थ) and not merely to itself alone (आत्मभरि). Therefore, whoever performs actions merely for himself is addicted to vice, while he who is engaged for the good of all is virtuous. According to Purī, being neutral (अपक्षपात) towards all is being bereft of vice. Thus, if one remains a witness to every experience, does not seek sensuous pleasures, does not feel proud of the good that one does, and remains continuously engaged for the good of all, one can be considered virtuous. Such a person is fully entitled to do this Aum-meditation.

#### PURPORT OF THE NAMES OF ṚṢIS

Ācārya Śaṅkara suggests that the Ṛṣis of the Ṛgveda attained the state of perfection due to the aforesaid Prāṇa-meditation : Purī exposes the reasons in detail. Since the seer (Ṛṣi) of the first maṇḍala lived upto a hundred years, he is called Satarchi. Similarly, the one who meditates on the prāṇa as the supporter of the body is called Mādhyamah. Due to swallowing prāṇa, the Ṛṣi is Gṛtsa, and due to defecating apāna he is mada; hence meditation on prāṇa and apāna simultaneously gives the name Gṛtsamad. Due to his love for the universe, the Ṛṣi became Viśvāmitra. Being beloved



of the gods, the Ṛṣi was Vāmadeva. Atri is so called because he meditates on the prāṇa as the redeemer of all sins. All these are some of the qualities suggested which should be developed by the aspirant who desires the final realization of this upāśanā.

#### OTHER FORMS OF THIS MEDITATION

The Upaniṣad further suggests Aum-meditation on the Sun as the rising sun. As the rising Sun destroys fear, so this meditation destroys the fear of birth and death. Likewise, as the Sun puts an end to the night, so does this meditation puts an end to ignorance. Due to these similarities, the meditation becomes easy. Furthermore, heat is an additional point of similarity between the Sun and the Prāṇa. The general rule to be understood here is that to achieve best results, meditation should be done after observing the similarities between the symbol and the symbolized.

Another form of this Prāṇa meditation is to see the word 'udgītha' as the symbol of Aum. Here Aum is symbolized just as the name Kṛṣṇa becomes the symbol of the person Kṛṣṇa, as long as the name and the person are non-distinguished.

#### AUM-MEDITATION WITHOUT RITUALS

Having laid down the various forms of Aum-meditation along with the performance of rituals, the Upaniṣad goes on to prescribe the Aum-meditation which ought to be done without rituals. Here again a story is fabricated.

Afraid of death, the gods entered the rituals. They covered themselves with all the mantras, hence the mantras are called chandas (छन्दः), the coverers. Ānanda Giri points out that though all the mantras are not utilized in any one ritual, yet, while utilizing the particular mantras for homa, the rest could be repeated as japa when not engaged in rituals. The gods, thus covered thought themselves safe. The idea, as Śrī Śaṅkara points out, is that by constantly engaging themselves in Vedic activity, some souls feel that they will attain immortality. But this is a false notion, for actions, no matter how pure, are always doomed to fructify in mortality. The gods later realized the futility of all actions, as they attained the purity brought about by fulfilling their duties according to the Veda. Śaṅkara points out that one should remain engaged in rituals only so long as one has not realized their futility. Having given up the rituals, the gods started practising Aum-meditation. Giri declares here, that since non-Vedic actions are renounced even by the ritualists, hence here renunciation of even Vedic actions is ordained. Narendrar Puri points out that though immortality and fearlessness are qualities associated only with Brahman, yet, if, after renouncing all rituals, Aum is meditated upon, with devotion, as having these qualities, immortality is attained. Śaṅkara lays down a principle which should be remembered in spiritual life. He says that though related to a king, some people are more close to him (अन्तरङ्ग) than others (बहिरङ्ग), but the Divine Being has no such scruples. All are equally dear to him. Hence, it is ascertained, that whoever perfects this Aum-meditation attains immortality which is absolutely identical with the one the gods achieved, neither a bit less, nor more.

## AUM-MEDITATION FULFILLS DESIRES

The Upaniṣad further lays down the Aum-meditation that leads to the birth of many sons. The important point to be noted here is that this meditation does not only bestow immortality, but also fulfills the desires. 'कामदं मोक्षदं चैव ओङ्काराय नमो नमः ।' For the attainment of all desired fruits, though engaged in any one ritualistic action, Aum should be meditated upon in the symbol of the person in the Sun, whose limbs are all golden. All the male (AM) and female (SA) principles are to be identified with AM and SA in Sāma, as the auxiliary meditations. Śaṅkara points out the principle behind symbolism. He says that though ordinary people are unable to perceive anything other than the symbol, yet those whose minds, due to renunciation of sensuous desires and practice of celibacy, have reached the state of Samādhi, do surely see the deity present in the symbol. Here too, such pure souls perceive the golden-limbed deity in the Sun. Upon this principle is founded the importance of idols, temples, pilgrim centres, etc.

The famous passage which, according to tradition, brought about the first schism on Vedānta, occurs here. The eyes of the aforesaid deity are compared to the lotus which is like the buttocks of a monkey (Kapyāsa), by Upaniṣad. Śaṅkara has given the obvious meaning of the term Kapyāsa as the buttocks of a monkey. But Rāmānuja resented it for he did not like this simile. Śaṅkara was conscious of such possible objection. So he explains the simile by saying that the Veda is comparing the colour of the lotus to the colour of monkey's buttocks, and not the eyes directly to the buttock. That is to say that the simile is for the colour of the lotus and not the eyes. Still Rāmānuja did not accept this meaning. He interpreted Kapi as the stalk of a lotus or as the Sun. Whatever the truth of the story, the important point to be noted is that Advaita takes the common meaning as important where as the Vaiṣṇavas take the derived meaning as important. Thus it becomes clear that Rāmānuja eventually gave rise to Arya Samāja which considered every common meaning redundant. This tendency of abandonment of the common meaning and preference for the derived meaning has subjected every scriptural statement of various and often contradictory meanings. The heretic movement in Vedānta, like such ones in other religions, led to faithlessness in ordinary followers.

The golden deity is associated with the eyes in the meditator's body. Śaṅkara maintains the identity of both, the aforesaid and this, Upāsanās. Purī says that the supreme Divinity is the conscious being in all the adjuncts where meditations are prescribed. The idea is that in all the symbols prescribed in the Upaniṣads, the symbolized, or the conscious deity is the Divine Being Himself. Purī goes to the extent of saying that even musicians who sing or play for worldly people, really sing the glories of Divinity only. This is similar to Yājñavalkya's statement that musicians, if true to their profession, go to Rudraloka. Śaṅkara points out that since musicians really sing the praise of Īśvara, so they get wealth. He means to suggest that even where one seems to get wealth from rich donors, one should realise that it is in reality God's Grace. Putting the

two together it seems that musicians attain wealth in this world and a higher plane of existence in the next. Even to this day we find that singers of Śāstriya music use devotional songs as the basis of their performance. Though they themselves may not have any devotion, yet they are able to create devotional feeling in an apt listener. It is stated in the Upaniṣad that by singing Sāmaveda, the singer bestows fulfilment of that which is desired by the sacrificer. Puri points out that only those who are entitled for Agniṣṭoma and such sacrifices, are entitled to be sacrificers (यजमान) in this case and get the desired result through the Sāmaveda-singing. But, it should be remembered, that only one who performs the sacrifice with the desire to offer its fruits to the Divine Being, is entitled to get the aforesaid result of having his desires fulfilled. Though the priest, desiring wealth, first meditates on the Devatā and then the centre of the body, yet the result ordained for the meditation as the part leading to grandeur is achieved by the sacrificer because of the sacrifice he has done in offering the result-fruit of the sacrifice to the Divine Being.

To ordain another form of this Aum-meditation, the Upaniṣad suggests directing the mind towards the Divine Being as the ultimately Real. No particular symbol is used for this meditation. The Upaniṣad relates a story that two Brahmins and one Kṣatriya were the best knowers of Aum. Once they got together and wanted to discuss about Aum with each other. Śaṅkara says that when a discussion is held amongst the knowers of a subject, everyone's ignorance is removed, new knowledge is gained, and doubts are rent asunder. So, one must discuss the subject with the one who knows it. Such a discussion extends the frontiers of one's knowledge about it. This is the main purport of all the seminars.

In the course of discussion, Śaṅkara says that to bear fruit of an action, space, time and incidental cause is necessary. The idea is that by avoiding anyone of them, one can save himself from suffering the result of any action. Thus fate is only determinative and not destiny.

#### THE STORY OF UṢASTI

In the next part comes the story of Uṣasti. Due to excessive hail-storms in that area, food was not available. The ṛṣi begged some elephant-drivers for food. They had nothing except some left-over, stale black-gram to offer to him. Uṣasti took and ate them. When they offered water, he refused saying that he could get it elsewhere also. Śaṅkara brings out the moral that a person who is famous for his knowledge and spiritual attainments, and is capable to do good to others, is entitled to do anything to save his life. In doing so he is not touched by any sin. But if he indulges in such acts when they are not necessary, sin will delve upon him. Giri makes it clear that here the Veda is not giving freedom to a knower of Prāṇavopāsanā to eat anything, as some people have tried to make out, but is only allowing him such freedom when it is absolutely necessary to do so for the maintenance of the life-force.

Uṣasti went to the yajña' which was being performed by a king, and declared that if any priest performed the ritual without having realized the divinity, he would be

lost. Śaṅkara says that the Upaniṣad is not denying the right of performance of the ritual to the ignorant, because it is held that mere ritual, without the knowledge of its divinity, takes one by the southern-route to the temporary heaven. What is being stated is that the ignorant should not perform the rites in front of a knower without his consent. Uṣasti taught the priests the related respective deities, and allowed them to complete the ritual. Thus it is clear that the realized one does not deprive the ignorants of their rights, but only shows them the true path to realization.

The next part deals with the meditation that brings enough food to the meditator. The deity here comes in the form of a dog. It is hereby suggested that when one gives himself to such mundane matters, one's ideal becomes low. Though some moderners have tried to take it as a satire on Vedic ritual, it is clear that nothing of that nature is meant here. It is surprising that a special meditation for a worldly gain is looked down upon by the same modern people who are day and night engaged in gaining such ends. One feels like airing the dictum—"Save us from our friends !"

The chapter ends with the meditation on certain other words used in singing Sāman like Haū (हाऊ), Haī (हाई), Iha (इह), Ī (ई), Ū (ऊ), E (ए), Ouhoyi (औहोयि), Hiṅkāra (हिङ्कार) etc. In the Vāmadeva-Sāman, water is meditated upon. The term Haī (हाई) is used in that Sāman. This term represents air which is meditated upon by the use of this term. The connection between air and water is explained by Narendra Puri. He shows a poetic trend of mind by suggesting that water, desirous of sexual enjoyment, entered the air; hence air and water are related in Vāmadeva Sāman. Such poetic passages are often misconstrued by the prosaic minds of people belonging to materialistic industrial cultures. We are pointing it out only to show that the concept of pornography and poetry are very different. One elevates an act, the other degenerates it. Reading the Veda, an extremely poetic creation, one should not try to pornograph it.

#### SĀMAN (THE SECOND CHAPTER)

The main topic of this chapter is the meditations associated with Sāman as a whole, compared to the previous one where it was on parts of Sāman.

#### MEDITATION ON SĀMAN AS THE GOOD.

The first meditations prescribed is to look upon Sāman as the good. Such a meditator is endowed with the good virtues prescribed in the Veda, and traditions, and enjoys their results as well. The Upaniṣad goes on to describe the practice of this meditation in detail in pentads and heptads. Śaṅkara gives a very interesting solution to the problem how to concentrate on two things simultaneously viz., Loka (State of experience) and goodness, in the symbol of Sāman. Just as clay and a pot are seen simultaneously because clay is the material cause of the pot, so can the Loka and goodness be simultaneously meditated upon because it is goodness, i. e. Dharma or Brahman, that is materially transformed into loka. He clearly enunciates that only two things are really good—Virtue and the Divine Being. Until one attains the Divinity, Virtue is the only good. After becoming adept in the Divine knowledge, Divinity alone is the good. One can easily

see here the importance of morality in Śaṅkara's scheme of spiritual ascent. Many Western and Eastern superficial observers often miss such passages, scattered as they are, and mis-construe his concept of a spiritually oriented life leading to absolute freedom. Moreover, here he has condescended to the ritualistic view that Dharma is the material cause of the universe, though as a Vedāntist he can only approve of the Divine Being as the material cause. At any rate, he makes it clear that it is possible to meditate in the aforesaid fashion, i.e., concentrating on loka and goodness simultaneously, because the material cause of loka is goodness itself.

An important point about meditation is laid down by Śaṅkara that even if a quality exists in an adjunct, it should not be meditated upon unless expressly ordained by the scriptures. The cause of loka as Dharma or the good can be inferred. But inference is not the *raison d'être* of this meditation; it is the Upaniṣad passage stated here. The modern intellect often forgets this and tries to cook up its own meditations that lead neither to material, nor spiritual gains.

Purī says that loka is the results, hence superior to parts of Sāman, which being the means, are inferior. It has been laid down that an inferior thing should be meditated upon as superior, and not vice versa. Hence the meaning of the passage is reversed. In Hīnkār (हिङ्कार) one should meditate the earth, in Prastāva (प्रस्ताव) fire, in Udgītha (उद्गीथ) sky, in Pratihāra (प्रतिहार) sun and in Nidhana (निधन) heaven. The same should also be meditated upon in the reverse order. To such meditators, lokas become objects of enjoyment. Similarly, in the parts of Sāman, the parts of rain are to be meditated leading to control over rains. The meditation is further prescribed on all the rivers, seasons, animals and vitality. There is an important statement of Śaṅkara here. Since eyes enlighten much more than Uttered words, eyes are better informers than words. Thus it is clear that in Vedānta, perception is superior to conception. Another revelation is that even super-sensuous objects are perceived by the mind. Therefore concentration of the mind leads to perception of even those things that are beyond the reach of senses. Here he is suggesting the parapsychological perception.

#### HEPTAD MEDITATIONS

In the next section the Upaniṣad lays down the heptad meditations which are similar to the pentad meditations. Some meditations here have extreme aesthetic orientation. For example, prior to sunrise, horses etc. hay (हिङ्कार), which is to be looked upon as their devotion to the sun; at sunrise men offer prayers to the sun which is their offering of devotion, at sunset the birds chirp which is their offering of devotion, and so on.

Śaṅkara lays down that it is the sun who preserves time by day and night. Hence he is also death, for death is but exhaustion of day and night. Thus Śaṅkara seems to support the solar time scale for everyday purpose, as well as for calculation of longevity. Many moderners hold that the annual birth chart (वर्षफल) is Mohammadan in origin, but this statement of the Ācārya gives lie to any such notion. Purī makes it clearer by saying that the solar day and night are by their regular and continuous move-

ment the cause of death. This world being the object of death is in its essential nature, miserable. Divine existence, on the contrary, is deathless, hence enjoyable. The twenty-one letters of the Sāman are divided into seven groups of three and they are to be meditated as the parts of Sāman for attaining immortality.

#### THE GĀYATRA SĀMAN

The Gāyatra Sāman is prescribed for longevity. It has the capacity to do good to oneself as well as others, This is made clear by both, Purī as well as Giri. Śaṅkara says that it leads to liberality, large heartedness. Naturally, the implied meaning is that one who practices Gāyatra should develop these qualities in himself. It is interesting to note that friendship towards all is prescribed even by Manu, for the one who wants to attain realization by repeating the Gāyatrī.

#### RATHĀNTARA AND OTHER MEDITATIONS.

Rathāntara (a type of sāman) is to be meditated in producing fire. Vāmadeva is to be similarly meditated in the sex act. Sun, rain, seasons, lokas, animals, organs etc., are to be meditated upon in different ways. In all such meditations, the common rule is not to think or speak ill of the object of meditation. Thus while meditating on the Sun, one should not feel bad when it shines brightly in summer, and so on. It is observed here by Śaṅkara that a person who abstains from eating meat and meditates all his life will have all his limbs intact till he lives. By the use of the plural form of the term 'meat' in the Upaniṣad, the Ācārya brings out the prohibition of fish also. This indicates that even in those times there were people believing that fish was not meat.

#### THREE DIVISIONS OF MEDITATORS : FOUR STAGES OF LIFE.

After a very technical meditation connected with svaras, the Upaniṣad goes on to state the virtues to be practised by one who does Aum-meditation independent of any ritualistic action. It divides such practitioners into three divisions, which have become established as the four stages or āśhramas of life. Out of these four, three are connected with Dharma and the fourth with Mokṣa. Śaṅkara is explicit that one must not conclude that only by meditation on Aum as part of Sāman, the results are attained. The truth, he says, is that whatever is attained by all the actions ordained in the Veda and meditations connected with Sāman, fall far short of the results that can be obtained by mere meditation on Aum only, bereft of all other rituals and ritualistic meditations.

The first stage of life is that of a householder where yajña, adhyayana and dāna are the duties. By yajña is meant the daily, occasional and other rituals prescribed in the Veda. Adhyayana means the study of Veda according to rules prescribed for it meditatively thinking of its meaning etc. Dāna is donating one's wealth according to one's capacity to the needy. Śaṅkara makes it clear that this refers to the Gṛhasthāśrama, even though the use of the word 'first' may lead one to misconstrue it as referring to the first āśrama, i.e. Brahmacharyaśram. The Upaniṣad is pointing to the most prevalent āśrama, or to the one that supplies men and material to the rest. The second stage is the Vānaprastha

and saṁnyāsaśrama. They are put together as austerity is the main virtue to be practised in both of them. Śaṅkara explains that the saṁnyāsa mentioned here refers to mere observance of the rules laid down for a saṁnyāsin in the Smṛtis and other such texts and which leads to heaven. The Vedic Saṁnyāsin is not included here who may be either a vividiṣu, i.e., an aspirant for realization or a Vidwan one who has realized the Divine. The third and the last stage is the Naiṣṭhika-brahmacarya in which one spends his whole life with the Guru while serving him. The student or Upakurvāṇa is not included here for that is but a stepping stone to these three, and hence does not lead directly to the heavenly abode. All these attain to heaven performing their respective duties. Those who are in addition given to meditation on Aum as Brahman are liberated after going to the abode of Maheśwara.

#### PARAMAHANSA SAṂNYĀSA

Śaṅkara takes this occasion to discuss in detail the saṁnyāsa of the Paramahansa type that leads to liberation even while alive. The editorial footnotes are relevant, and refer to the Brahma-Sūtra portions where this issue has been discussed threadbare. The earlier comments following the ritualist tradition asserted that since all saṁnyāsins have been ordained to follow the rules to control their bodies and minds, they are all covered by the second stage of austerity. Hence, according to them, the meaning should be taken that all those who follow the respective allotted duties of their āśrama attain heaven, and those who, in addition, are devoted to Brahman as Aum attain immortality. The word 'Brahmasaṁstha' need not be taken to refer to a Paramahansa alone, for it is a yugic (of derivative, meaning and not a common name referring to a Paramahansa. Otherwise, the often repeated assertion of the Upaniṣads, that realization of the Divine leads to immortality, will be in vain, since a Paramahansa will gain it without knowledge. Thus whether Paramahansa or any one else, one should always observe the rules laid down for him in the Veda and tradition, and if one wants immortality, he should try to attain knowledge in the extra time, after completing his ordained duties. This is the view of those who believe in simultaneous observance of rules and spiritual seeking. This view is prevalent today as then, and often Paramahansas are criticised for their non-observance of the rules laid down for them in the traditional texts.

Śaṅkara hammers this view until it is totally demolished. Here the great Ācārya shines as the crest-jewel of true orthodoxy which allows a real saṁnyāsin to outgrow all limitations imposed upon him, and shine as brilliantly as the Divine Being Himself in his unlimited all-inclusive love. Śaṅkara holds that realization is the only duty of a Paramahansa. Other practices of controlling the body, mind etc. are only natural corollaries of the identity of his self with the Supreme Being. Hence the term Brahmasaṁstha can only refer to him and none else. Those who are not Paramahansas have duties to follow, so they cannot possibly attain the One who is dutiless. If even a Paramahansa is allotted any duty apart from becoming dutiless, none will ever attain

the state of Brahmasaṁstha. All duties are possible when one considers himself as an independent agent of action, and sees the variety of instruments, actions, their results, etc. This variety cannot, asserts Śaṅkara, be ordained by the Veda, as all beings naturally consider themselves as agents of actions, see instruments of actions, and drive themselves towards a desired goal. Thus all prescribed duties are only a concession to the natural human situation, that is to say that if one has to do actions, then he must do the ones ordained by the Veda. The scriptures only aim at leading one to the realization that he is not an agent of action, nor is the variety that he sees, real; he and everything else is but the Supreme Divinity. Puri points out that duties are assigned only after one has identified himself with a body which is untrue in its essence, and has endowed it further with such adjuncts as Brahmin etc. The one who knows this to be the case can never indulge in any ordained action and can only renounce all actions. Renunciation of all actions is the entry into the formal Paramahansa station of life, Puri further declares that if someone asserts that he knows the Divine and yet feels a sense of duty, then, truly, he is but a hypocrite.

The duty-oriented thinkers object to this view by saying, that, even a Paramahansa acts when he begs his food etc., similarly he can perform other duties. At the face of it, it seems to be a legitimate objection. But Śaṅkara shows how the analysis of the objection gives a lie to its legitimacy. Duties are to be decided by analysing their rightness, and not merely by what appears for the moment. Begging is not done due to scriptural injunction or by considering it to be the right conduct. Hunger leads anyone to begging in absence of any other means to appease it. But, on the other hand, duties are to be attended to regularly, not whimsically. Rituals are to be performed properly in order. These are successive acts performable at a particular time and place, after deciding what one is ordained to do. A Brahmin's duty is different from a Śūdra's duty, and morning duties are not evening duties. What is proper to do in a temple is not proper to do in a lavatory, and so on. As for appeasing hunger goes, one can do it even while knowing it to be merely an appearance, for one does not have to determine the correctness of procedure etc. Moreover, eating has a 'Seen' result, and not an 'unseen' one, while duties have only 'unseen' results; therefore, without the desire for an 'unseen' result, the drive to perform duties is absent. Hunger is natural and not desired, so appeasing it is also not due to desire.

If it be argued that by seeing a Paramahansa in act of begging, one may feel that action and knowledge can go hand in hand, then the answer is that by an action of a person, one cannot deduce the correctness or otherwise of it. Just as by seeing an intelligent man at times indulging in killing, which is prohibited, one does not conclude that killing is allowed. Puri points out that one should think about the correctness of an experience and not give illustration of an appearance of an act that results from the appearance of an experience. The man of realization does not assert even the reality of hunger, much less the reality of his act of



begging, or tries to support its propriety. Thus, whatever a Paramahansa does is due to his innate nature and not ordinations, and he considers all of them bereft of reality or value.

The same cannot be said about the ordained duties. It is clear from stxet dealing with Paramahansa-saṁnyāsa that a Paramahansa is continually seeing or trying to see the non-differentiated Divine Being, and if due to any reason he sees otherwise, he knows it to be false. All his actions are due to natural instincts, and are not directed to 'unseen' results or means. As a symbol of this, he renounces the tuft (शिखर) and the thread (यज्ञोपवीत) which endow the individual with rights to perform religious rituals, Along with these he renounces his social, economic and other rights also. Having renounced all this he has nothing but what has been provided by God. Begging is due to absence of any right or possession. What he does is just the fulfilment of the will of God, which, to others, appears as his Prārabdha, is the result of his previous acts. Purī points out that means are always for ends. If ends are renounced, means are automatically renounced. If one does not have as his aim, otherworldly joys, why will he keep the burden of the tuft and thread. And, if they are not kept, how will one remain a grīhastha.

Ācārya Śaṅkara gives one of the most beautiful definitions of a Paramahansa by saying that absence of ownership of any type is his hall mark. Even his abstinence from prohibited acts is due to past habits rather than any fear of its results. Actually, unethical conduct results from attachment to the desired result, and since a Paramahansa is bereft of any such attachment, it is just impossible for him to indulge in an unethical act. Thus, Śaṅkara concludes, austerity cannot indicate a Paramahansa since, like other rituals, austerity is also not practised by him. It is the declaration of Śaṅkara that this is the only Saṁnyās laid down by the Veda, the acceptance of staff, waterpots etc. as prescribed by the smṛtis is not Vedic Saṁnyāsa. The Veda only states the following as components of Saṁnyāsa : a completely shaven head, being bereft of possessions, unattachment, and being beyond all the stages of life including the so-called Saṁnyāsa. The smṛtis also support this Vaidic Saṁnyāsa calling it saṁnyasa bereft of all forms because such a saṁnyasin has no real faith in formal religion etc., considering them as non-essential. Śaṅkara further asserts that the renunciation of Sāṅkhyas, Yogins, Buddhists, lazy ignorants etc. is hypocritic, for they consider themselves as renouncers of actions. The sense of unity attained by the study of the upaniṣads is the only true renunciation and such a renouncer is the true Brahmasaṁstha, Therefore, if a grīhastha realises the Truth, he will have no other alternative but to renounce, and no sin will be incurred thus. Purī remarks that the mind is by nature active. Hence if one is associated with it, one can never achieve actionlessness. As to vairāgya (वैराग्य), only by itself it can make one only a semi-saṁnyāsin, for bereft of love for the Divine Being it cannot lead to actionlessness. As far as the renunciation by the grīhastha goes, it cannot lead to any sin, since his realization is that one atman alone is true, Agni etc.

whether physical or divinities, are untrue, and renunciation of an untrue object cannot lead to any fault.

The Upaniṣad goes on to describe Aum as all. By knowing, and being established in it, one becomes All. The chapter ends with the description of the knowledge associated with Sāman.

#### MADHU VIDYĀ

Meditation on the Sun was taught to the Virāṭ by Brahmā, who in turn taught it to Manu. This is exactly the succession in the fourth chapter of the Gītā, hence Śaṅkara adds that Manu taught it to Ikṣwaku. Often, because of this, modern writers have claimed that this knowledge was confined to the Kṣatriyas first. But the present upaniṣad gives lie to it in as much as a second succession of teachers is given, starting from Uddālaka Āruṇi. He teaches it to his eldest son, and so on. Śaṅkara calls it Brahma-Vidyā. Purī remarks that two lineages of teachers are to indicate that this vidyā may be taught either to the dearest son, or to a fit disciple. One should never teach it for the sake of money, even if it be more than excessive.

The Sun is the fulfilment of all sacrifices. Hence he is the life of all beings. Therefore, after meditations, associated with sacrifice, meditation associated with its results naturally follows. This meditation leads to liberation, asserts Giri. The Sun is called 'honey' because it gives joy to Gods and wise ones. Space is the honey-comb where the rays exist as the bees. In a beautiful analogy, Vaidic karma, or the Brāhmaṇas that describe it, is called the flower, and the mantras to be used are called the honey-bees. The offered soma, milk, ghee etc. is the essence that the honey-bees collect. R̥gveda is associated with the redness of the sun, Yajurveda with the whiteness, Sāmaveda with the blackness and Atharvaveda with pitchblackness. Upaniṣad is associated with the moving flames that are seen when the sun is seen with concentrated attention. This last association is important, for it clearly enunciates the method by which the mind is to see Brahman while meditating. This universe or manifestation is the flames of the sun of existence, knowledge and bliss absolute.

Śaṅkara observes that sunrise merely means the visibility of the sun to the people living in that region. The sunset is similarly its invisibility. In reality, the sun neither rises nor sets. He further defines Amarāvati where the sun is at its zenith when seen from Saṁyamanī as rising. This means that saṁyamanī is in the west of Amarāvati by six hours. Vārūni again is six hours west of Saṁyamanī. This gives the longitudes of these places. The sun stays twice as long in Saṁyamanī as in Amarāvati. This gives the latitude. These are important informations in determining Paurāṇic geography. For a realized soul, living in Brahman, the sun neither sets nor rises. Thus the Veda is clear in enunciating, that no fruits of Karma touch or give enjoyment to the knower.

The Madhu-vidyā is also described in the Bṛhadāraṇyaka-upaniṣad where Dadhyaṇ Ātharvaṇa teaches it to Aśvinī kumāras. Thus, this knowledge is associated

with at least three Vedas, viz. Sāmā, Yajus and Atharva. This is one of the most important vidyās in the Upaniṣads.

#### GĀYATRĪ

The Brahmanvidyā described in the Madhu section is again taught through Gāyatrī meditation in as much as Gāyatrī is dedicated to the Sun. Śaṅkara points out that the purpose of the upaniṣad is to teach the adjunctless Divine Being, but as It is difficult to be understood, it is taught through various adjuncts. Purī makes a wonderful remark that it is those who are given to rituals that cannot easily comprehend the Truth, for their intellect does not attain stability. He is, thereby, implying that rituals, as they are associated with desires, only make a person more addicted to desired objects rather than desire the desireless.

#### THE METRE AND PLACE OF MEDITATION

Gāyatrī is chosen, for, no other metre was able to bring Soma, according to Śatapatha. For a Brāhmaṇa, Śaṅkara says, Gāyatrī is like the mother. Just as this metre is the most glorious amongst metres, Brahman is the most glorious in the whole world. Purī points out that even for a ritualist, daily meditation on Gāyatrī is ordained, so it is clear, that to think of the Divine Being as associated with Gāyatrī is easily done by him with a concentrated mind. Purī makes out that even for the purpose of meditation, a valid super-imposition is to be preferred to an invalid one. This he derives from the fact that the upaniṣad leads to Brahman through the identification of the word with Gāyatrī and thence to Brahman instead of direct identification of Brahman with the metre. This observation is very important as often Śaṅkara gives some reason or other for the super-imposition of the symbolised on the symbol. Here we find the rationale of it. This meditation is to be attempted in the heart centre. This heart is described as having five gates, namely the Prāṇa, Apāna, Vyāna, Samāna and Udāna associated respectively with the Sun, Moon, Agni (Fire), Parjanya (Cloud) and space.

#### ŚĀṆḌILYA VIDYĀ

One of the most important and practical meditation is prescribed by Śāṇḍilya. Let one think that all that exists is nothing but the Divine, since all is born from It, is supported by It, and eventually merges in it. Purī remarks that so far symbols were prescribed, now, leaving off the symbol, direct meditation on the Supreme Divine Being is ordained. Since Śiva is everything, one should neither like nor dislike any person, thing or situation. This makes one perfect. Purī further informs that this meditation should be repeated until one attains the vision of the Truth. Śaṅkara says that whatever one is sure of while living, he becomes surely even after death. This is really the secret of all religions. Hence if one is sure of all as Śiva, one becomes absorbed in Him after death.

One must think of Śiva both as the drawer and withdrawer of the mind. The power of knowing and acting is His form, and conscious-shining is His reality. Śiva's wishes always come true, as compared to the wishes of the soul (jīva) which, directed towards the untrue, result in unattainment. Śiva alone does everything but is bereft of all vices and their results. Though He is meditated upon as smaller than the smallest, he is really greater than the greatest. This is taught by Śaṇḍilya. Śaṅkara makes it clear that this is not to be taken as the knowledge section. Hence all the qualities are meant to be meditated upon as ordained. The meditation is to be practised until death. One attains Śiva-identity by practising it. One is reminded of Pāñcadaśī's Dhyānadīpa-prakaraṇa. It is clear that Vidyāranya has taken his clue from the Bhaṣya here.

After a small section dealing with longevity and bringing up a son in the proper way, the upaniṣad goes on to another important section.

#### JĪVANA YAJÑA

The knowledge of this portion was taught to Śrī Kṛṣṇa and Gītā is its extension with the Kāṭha and Śvetāśvatara supplying flesh to the bones. Ghora Āṅgīrasa was the teacher. Surprisingly, none of the annotations give any indication whether Kṛṣṇa mentioned here is Bhagavān Kṛṣṇa or someone else. Mahābhārata tells up about Sāndīpanī as Lord Kṛṣṇa's teacher and Upamanyu as the one who initiated him into Śiva Dharma leading him to the vision of Śiva. But no light is thrown on Ghora or anyone else initiating him into the mysteries of Brahma-vidyā. Hence one is not in a position to verify that Bhagavān Kṛṣṇa is the son of Devakī referred to here. And yet, it is highly improbable that two persons of similar maternal descent, were equally famous, and both of them had the same philosophy of life and realizations. Anyhow, Purī and Giri, in an indirect way, support the identity of the two by asserting that this reference is to a famous person so as to extol the knowledge and not that the story is narrated merely to explain it better. The life span mentioned here is one hundred and sixteen years ( $24 + 44 + 48 = 116$ ). If one adds number nine which was Kṛṣṇa's age when he entered Mathurā one gets the number one hundred and twenty five exactly the age at which Bhagavān Kṛṣṇa left the mortal coil. 'Acyuta' is also a significant word in this context. The fact that Uddhava Gītā was the last message of Śrī Bhagavān also seems to be indicated here. It is important to note that the Mahābhārata also has it this way. Anyhow, Śaṅkara adopts a very critical approach of a modern scholar in neither asserting, nor denying the identity in absence of a positive proof either way.

#### MEDITATION UPON ONE-SELF AS THE SYMBOL OF YAJÑA

A man should meditate upon himself as the symbol of Yajña. This meditation leads to longevity as it did to Mahidāsa, the son of Itarā who is the seer of the famous R̥gveda, Brāhmaṇa, Āraṇyaka and Upaniṣad. Life is divided into three parts. The first part consists of the first twenty four years and is to be identified with the morning

sacrifice. In this, gāyatrī metre is important and as it has twenty four syllables, it can easily be identified with the twenty four years. The morning sacrifice has Vasu as the important god. In the man, elan vital is the Vasu, for if it abides, everything else can abide in life. One is reminded of Bhagavān Kṛṣṇa's Vṛndāvana līlā in which he struggled to maintain his life inspite of all the demons sent by Kāṁsa. The upaniṣad says that if any demon of death approaches in this period of life, one should pray to Vasu, identifying it with Prāṇa, saying, 'Since I am making my life into a sacrifice, i.e. instead of aiming at enjoyment, am living my life according to Śiva's will, therefore may it not be discontinued, but may continue into the noon-service'. The upaniṣad declares that such recitation and meditation removes disease and the suffering caused by it.

The next forty four years are to be meditated upon as the noon-sacrifice. In this, triṣṭubh (त्रिष्टुभ) metre is important which has forty four syllables. The main deity is Rudra. Here also the Prāṇa is to be meditated upon as Rudra because they are cruel in this mid-period of life causing everyone to cry. Again, the Mathurā līlā of Bhagavān is to be recalled where he had enough heart-aches to cry. To avoid death, one should recite a similar prayer, as before. This time he should pray to Rudra identifying Him with the Prāṇa.

The last forty eight years are the evening-service in which jagatī (जगती) metre is important, having the same number of syllables as the years. The main deity is Āditya who is to be again meditated upon in the Prāṇa. Prāṇa is identified with Āditya since it absorbs or swallows sound etc. If disease attacks during this age, one should meditate upon Prāṇa and Āditya to complete a hundred and sixteen years. One is reminded of the Dvārakā līlā of Śrī Kṛṣṇa in which he withdrew everyone in himself, whether the Kauravas, or the Yādavas.

The two most important suggestions are that in the early age one should accumulate knowledge as much as possible like the Vasus. In the middle age one should shine in action and wisdom as much as possible like Rudra or the mid-day Sun. The last portion of life is for withdrawing within, all that one has extended. In Sāṅkhya terminology, Sattva should prevail first, Rajas next and Tamas last. It is strange that Śrī Bhagavān's life corresponds to it except that he took exactly three more years in each stage. According to one tradition supported by Mahārāsa, he was a Purush, i.e. sixteen years old, when the life began. At the age of twenty four (16+8) he did Mahārāsa and when twenty seven (16+11) he entered Kāṁsa's court starting his Mathurā līlā. Again at seventy four (27+44+3) he led the delegation to Dhṛtarāṣṭra's court preceeding the Mahābhārata war and at the age of a hundred and twenty-five (74+48+3) he ended his life. Chāndogya-upaniṣad, realising this extension of nine years, seems to cite Mahīdāsa Aitareya's life of a hundred and sixteen years for the longevity rather than Śrī Bhagavān's.

#### PRĀṆA AS MANIFESTATION OF ALL GODS

Another important statement is to regard the Prāṇa, i.e. the life-force as the manifestation of all the gods and to take care that one is not forced to lead a handi-

capped life from lack of vigour due to diseases. All attention must be paid to keep perfect health and regard it as part of spiritual life. One must have the guts to tell diseases that since his life-force is very strong, they cannot kill him. The upaniṣad has declared that anyone who is self-confident will live up to a hundred and sixteen years. It is clearly asserted that for those who have a strong will associated with proper meditation, death is not pre-destined. It also informs that before one dies, it is the mind that loses hold on life first. Such courageous attitude is prominent by its absence in the later literature.

#### RITUALISTIC DETAILS

The next section lays down the ritualistic details of this meditation. Hunger, thirst, unavailability of beloved's company, etc. that cause pain are to be considered as Dikṣā, because of the similarity of pain in both. Upasada is what is eaten, drunk or enjoyed by the attainment of the beloved's company. Upasada is the milk allowed on Lent days. Thus, it is a cause of joy and removes excessive pain. This is the similarity. Laughter, food, sexual indulgence are the divine praise, both being noisy. Strengthening the virtues of austerity, charity, simplicity, love and truth are fees to the priest. Birth is the abhiṣava (Sprinkling) of Soma. Death is the ablution. Knowing this, Kṛṣṇa, the son of Devakī, became desireless. Śaṅkara asserts, that after this Kṛṣṇa did not desire to possess any other knowledge. A man who practises this should recite at the end of his life three mantras. Identifying Prāṇa and Āditya, he should meditate on them as indestructible, infallible and extremely atomic.

#### SIMPLER MEDITATION

The upaniṣad follows this up by a simpler meditation on mind, with voice, vitality, eyes and ears as its divisions, in the body as the Supreme Divine Being. Simultaneously, meditation of space as Brahman, in the cosmos with fire, wind, sun and the directions as its divisions is to be carried on. Śaṅkara says that by eating oil, ghee etc., which are fire, the voice shines forth and is always eager to speak out. Someone, it is said, attained identity with the Supreme Divinity as a result of this meditation. The purpose of this meditation is to see that Śiva shines in the mind of the individual as the guide or director of senses etc., and in the universe as the abode of all that exists. Thus, in the cosmos, existence of all is Śiva, and in the individual, He is consciousness.

#### SUN

The sun should be meditated as the Divine Being. In the beginning everything was unmanifest. Then all became manifest. The upaniṣad gives a poetic simile of the birth of the first child of God, which, Śaṅkara points out, is only to help the meditator in identifying the Sun with God. Just as prior to sunrise, all is hidden in darkness, and after it, all becomes manifest, so it is in creation.

Śaṅkara has made some interesting observations in this section. First he points out that out of nothing only nothing can be manifest. Even the Veda cannot

alter this. Though alternative courses are possible in actions or rituals, they are not possible as regards to reality, or even relatively real things. Therefore a Vedāntin can never compromise even on topics of everyday-life. This is the scientific view.

Śrī Śaṅkara establishes the factuality of this meditation by pointing out that the Sun is the creator of all that exists on the earth. As we know today, the earth is a product of the Sun by coming in close gravitational force of another Sun. Even now all our energy is received from it. The scientific importance of this statement is clear. Without energy from the Sun all consciousness of the world would be lost. Therefore the Sun is a fit symbol to meditate as the Divine Being.

Śaṅkara further points out that from absolute calm, a slight vibration towards the slightest manifestation took place. Thus he suggests an evolutionary trend rather than the Big-bang theory in creation. By saying that vibrations bring out the creation he seems to suggest even a continual creation due to vibrations or movements in the electromagnetic fields.

There is a reference to king Pūrṇavarman in whose absence the regal institution is as good as non-existing. It will be interesting to determine this king who must have been a very great one and perhaps, a Hindu. Purī points out a particular sound which is made in Bengal during auspicious celebrations. This indicates Bengal as either Narendrapurī's paternal home or his intimate contact with that region. Absence of any Navya-nyāya terminology in his work substantiates the second possibility.

#### SAMVARGA

After the meditation on the Sun, the Sūtrātmā-meditation is taken up. As a matter of fact, Prāṇa or Vayu is the major symbol in the Chāndogya-upaniṣad. It is hence described in great detail in various forms. This portion is also called 'Samvarga Vidya' because in it fire, Sun, moon and water are seen as merging into the air. Śaṅkara informs that fire cannot exist without air, Sun and moon cannot move without it, and water gets evaporated into it, hence they are said to be one with it. According to the order of creation also, tejas comes out of air. The same is true for Prāṇa also, since during sleep, voice, ear, eye and mind are all merged into it. Thus the identity of the two are to be meditated upon.

Actually Vayu or air is the physical energy, and Prāṇa is the vital energy. The upaniṣad asserts the identity of the two. That they are inter-convertible, is proved scientifically. Purī makes it clear that the two meditations are to be practised separately. This implies that while engaged in external actions and drawing on the biological energy, one should concentrate on the physical energy. This is very important, for the first will direct us to proper action, understanding, saving and suitable utilization of physical energy, while the second will give us relaxation and understanding of our own self.

Thus this is a very scientific and practical meditation worthy of the importance it has received in the scriptures.

The story connected with the preaching of this meditation is an interesting one, and sheds a lot of light on separate topics. The Brahma-Sūtras practically exhaust. Sūdrādhikaraṇa on this one story and its implications. Śaṅkara however, after laying down that meditation on Vayu and Prāṇa directly as the Supreme Being is being ordained goes on to say that the story is for easy comprehension; for showing the rules for receiving and giving of the knowledge; and for laying down of faith, charity, humility etc. as pre-requisites of knowledge. It is made clear by Purī that the knowledge of Brahman under discussion here is that of the manifest or 'lower' one, and not the Absolute Brahman.

A king who was old enough to have a grandson and was himself the son of Jānaśruti, was a man of faith. He had high repute of donating charities. Much food was cooked at his house for guests. He opened food-houses for free distribution of food along with Dharmaśālās for free lodging everywhere. In spite of this virtue of charity, he desired fame. Ṛṣis or Devatas wanted to guide him to higher virtues. So, taking the form of Swans, one day, they crossed over his palace while he was asleep at the roof, praising Raikva. Jānaśruti could not stand it, and so he searched out the preacher, who was staying under a cart, scratching his scabies. At first the preacher insulted Jānaśruti by calling him a śūdra. But, when the king offered his young daughter to him. Raikva revealed the knowledge of meditation of 'lower' Brahman in the form of energy. This, in a nutshell, is the story.

The great Ācharya, Śaṅkara, gives the clue to the meaning of the names in the story. One of the swans named Bhallākṣa to show that though a Brahmajñānī by name, he was so careless as to cross over the king's body. Purī explains that even though he considered himself a person of knowledge, yet he was not even conscious of such simple propriety of not crossing over a great soul. Even a wise person should behave in an ideal way and not be careless in everyday affairs.

Jānaśruti means a traditional lore or a folk-lore. Hence, it is suggested that though the story was so old that even grand-father did not know its origin, yet it had no authenticity. Thus it becomes clear that certain implied meanings are more important here than the lexicon ones. At the same time the moderners' criticism of Raikva is uncalled for, as the story is a heresay rather than historical. Anyway the king was reputed to be a man of great charitable disposition. The upaniṣad is trying to emphasise that love for God, which Raikva had, is more important than charity, though it was because of his charity that the Ṛṣis or gods were interested to show the king the higher path. Thus charity is a way to please the Ṛṣis or gods. The upaniṣad does not discriminate amongst the recipients of charity, so all are entitled to it. Acceptance of gifts (परिग्रह) is not open to all, but charity is. Food and shelter may be given to all without any discrimination, is the suggested point to be noted.



Raikva was praised as the recipient of all the good things done. Śaṅkara significantly points out that by knowledge and devotion of the Divine Being one attains the fruits of all the good actions. The Gītā says that when one knows the Lord, he is like the one who has attained the flood waters, needing no more water from a well or otherwise. Purī clearly says that a man of Knowledge is worthy of praise, not a mere king even though given to good deeds. Here again the message of Hinduism throughout the centuries is being reverberated that knowledge and devotion to Śiva is far superior than all the other charities and rituals.

Raikva had a cart, indicating that he was not an anchorite and yet a continuous traveller without a permanent abode. This is to show his detachment. Such a one prefers to stay in a solitary location either in a forest or on a river bank, says Śaṅkara. But Raikva wanted to enter a householder's life, and needed money for it. Since without a wife one is not allowed to possess wealth, he did not accept it until the king offered him his daughter in wed-lock. Money and service are the two important inducements for importing knowledge. Jānaśruti supplies money and gives his daughter to serve the preacher. Thus Raikva is pleased, and agrees to teach.

The preacher first addressed the king as śūdra, because Jānaśruti, being a king, should not have offered money without Raikva's entering gṛahasthāśrama. He also wanted to support what the swan had indicated. By showing his power of knowing that the king was sorrowful due to the swan's statement he indicated that knowledge was superior to charity. Sorrow is the definite indication of a śūdra. Even the smṛtis lay down that one whose near and dear one has died leading to sorrow should be considered as impure as a śūdra. Śaṅkara, anyhow holds, that the desire to attain knowledge by mere offering of wealth without serving the preceptor is a sign of a śūdra. Anyway, all these morals indicate that Jānaśruti was merely called a śūdra, rather than being one. It is interesting to note that Raikva means the one who is in search of wealth (Rai = wealth, Kva = where). This indicates that having perfected himself in devotion he wanted to practise devotion with duties. For this he had to enter the householder's station of life. Thus the need for the wife, and the wealth. This is to point out that devotion to 'lower' Brahman must be associated with duties. This has been prescribed in the Īśāvasya by laying down that vidyā and avidyā must not be practised alone. Thus Jānaśruti symbolizes action without devotion, and Raikva, devotion without action. Both become complete by coming together. This is the final moral of the story.

The Saṁvarga-vidyā is praised by an interesting episode. The son of Śunaka belonging to the Kapigotra, and Abhipratārin the son of Kakṣasena were being served food when a brahmacārī begged it of them. They refused to give it to him. Śaṅkara informs that though a brahmacārī, he was a hero amongst the knowers of Brahman. Desirous of knowing what he had to teach they refused the food. This clearly shows that not giving alms to the needy was unheard of during those days. That is why Śaṅkara

had to explain the situation. The Brahmacārī said that the one who swallows and protects the world is not known to the ignorant. That Divine Being stays in the bodies of mortals and immortals. It was to Him that they had refused the food. Kāpeya understood the truth. He told the Brahmacārī about his adoration for that very Divine Being who eats not, and yet eats everything through the senses. He ordered for food to be served to the brahmacārī. Here śruti teaches us to look upon Prāṇa as Śiva, and give food to the needy. This seems to be a part of Saṁvarga-vidyā.

#### SATYAKĀMA

The story of Satyakāma is another episode often discussed in modern literature. The editor has discussed brilliantly in his notes the implications of the story, and has answered in a nutshell all possible modern arguments. The story runs as follows :—

Satyakāma, the son of Jabālā asked his mother his gotra, as he wished to stay with a teacher as a brahmacārī for studying. Jabālā answered that being busy in serving the guests during her younger years, when he was born, and as his father died early, she did not find out the gotra. She further instructed him to introduce himself by his name Satyakāma, the son of Jabālā. The boy went to the son of Hāridrumata of gautama gotra, and asked to be initiated in brahmacharya. On being asked his gotra, he told the teacher whatever he had heard from his mother. Hāridrumata said that only a brahmin could speak thus. Hence he would initiate him since he had stuck to the truth. After initiation, he gave the brahmacārī four hundred weak and emaciated cows out of the ones he had and asked him to go, and he said he would not return until they multiplied to be a thousand.

Satyakāma served the cows for a long period and when they became a thousand, the Ox came and told him that as they had reached the desired number, they should be taken back to the preceptor's āśrama. He also told Satyakāma the four divisions of the first quarter as the quarter of Brahman who is called the Light. The Ox further added that the second quarter will be taught by fire. The next day he drove the cows towards his guru's abode. At sunset he lit the fire and was sitting by it for homa when the fire addressed him and taught the earth, space, heaven and ocean as the second quarter of Brahman, whose name is Infinity. He also added that the swan would teach him the third quarter. The next evening at camp-fire, a swan came and taught fire, sun, moon and lightning as the third quarter of Brahman called Brilliant. He told Satyakāma that Madgu, an aquatic bird, would teach him the last quarter. Next evening, again as he sat by a fire, Madgu came and taught vitality, eyes, ears and mind as the last quarter of Brahman called the Abode.

Satyakāma reached his guru's āśrama. The Guru exclaimed that he was shining like a knower of Brahman, and enquired about the teacher who had taught him. Satyakāma informed him that he had been taught by non-human beings. But, he

added, he would only be satisfied when taught by the guru, for he knew that the knowledge attained by the teaching of the preceptor alone was the best. Hāridrumata told him that the sixteen parts and the four names should be meditated together without leaving off any part. Thus the teacher though supporting the knowledge delivered by non-human agencies, yet added something new. Here the story ends.

CRITICISM OF THE MODERNERS' VIEW ABOUT SATYAKĀMA'S  
[MATERNAL] PARENTAGE

Though the most questionable part of the story should have been the non-human agencies like ox, fire, swan and madgu teaching and behaving in human fashion, yet we have not found a single modern writer questioning or doubting this part. What they want to draw from the story is the moral that Satyakāma was the son of a whore, and since he spoke the truth about it, he was accepted as a brahman similarly even if their mothers be whores, they should be accepted as brahmans if they tell the truth about it ! The one interesting thing that has always struck us as peculiar is that none of these writers have truthfully spoken of their mothers as whores. They are interested in establishing the fact that varṇa is determined by character and therefore ignore the main moral of the story : a devoted person will get knowledge even from non-human agents. Only those who have the power to gain knowledge in such a way can possibly be considered brahmans without proper credentials. In spite of gaining such wisdom, Satyakāma is humble enough to tell his guru that he does not consider such teachings worth anything, and respects only the knowledge received from his guru. If these modern writers even have a glimpse of the non-human vision, they will jump to the conclusion that they have a divine origin and will surely look down upon all teachers and brahmans. Yet, it is strange that they quote this story based upon the virtues of truth and humility. It is important to note that Satyakāma says that he has heard the glory of gurus from the lips of people as great as Gautama. Now, after initiation, he had not stayed in the āśrama but had lived in the forest. So he must have heard it as a child living with his mother. His mother must have been staying with such great souls as his own teachers. And yet Jabālā is considered a woman of low character ! One must remember the proverb which says, to judge a person by the company he keeps. It is sure that she was a moral lady, Only in this light one should judge her statement, as done by Śaṅkara, Madhva and followers of Rāmānuja. The question of varṇa was neither raised by Satyakāma, nor by Hāridrumata. This is merely the imagination of the fertile brains of the immorally inclined moderners. The question was about gotra, the ṛṣi lineage. Most of the modern men, what to speak of Jabālā, woman a, if asked about their gotras would draw a blank; and yet if they are called sons of whores, they would be deeply hurt. Varṇa is not gotra. Only at certain important occasions, the knowledge of gotra is needed for social purposes. Hence ladies can be quite ignorant about it. The misconception is due to Gautama's remark, which in reality was just a praise of Satyakāma. He knew the boy as a brahman, but

needed to know the gotra to perform the rite of initiation, which differs according to gotra and the branch of Veda. When the young man spoke the truth, he could not help but exclaim that only brahmans are such straightforward and truthful. He has nowhere suggested that because of this he concluded the brahman-hood of the boy, or decided to initiate him. He did not conclude his gotra, which he should have, if the modern interpretation that truth revealed the answer to his question had any basis. At the end also he exclaims that Satyakāma appears to have wisdom. Does the moderner conclude that a wise can be found out thus? The śruti makes it clear that Hāridrumata was in the habit of making exclamations whenever he was emotionally moved. As Śaṅkara points out, care-free, calmed senses, smiling face and satisfied look of Satyakāma drew out the exclamation, for he least expected the youth in such a mood after such a long exile. These are indications of wisdom and not determinants of it. Similar is the case of connection of truth and plain speaking with brāhmaṇhood.

Śaṅkara and other orthodox commentators are of course very clear about the whole matter and do not try any text-torturing as the moderners, who fail miserably in their attempt, mainly because before even reading the lines, they try to read between them. Neither the word 'car' (चर), nor the word 'paricar' (परिचर) is associated with any sense of sexual behaviour. As for 'bahu' (बहु) and 'carantī' (चरन्ती), they would have a better case in an earlier passage where the word 'ātikyā' (आटिक्या) is used, but Śaṅkara gives the dictionary meaning as the one who has not yet become even young, i.e. one whose breast and other feminine features are not yet manifest. He does not even hint any immorality or try to give a different meaning because the word has no such connotation. But, of course, in this age of Freud, every movement may be associated with sex, and thus there is no wonder that such frustrated people who see even the purest love of a mother as nothing but Oedipus-complex, see Jabālā as a libertine. Sometimes we have wondered if the śruti has put this story as a Research test to find out the readers' inhibited complexes.

Śaṅkara, on the other hand, reads faith and austerity as the purpose of the story. This is true to the context, as Satyakāma is faithful to his teacher, inspite of being taught by non-human sources. Not knowing the gotra, Hāridrumata, in a fix to decide the particular branch in which Satyakāma should be initiated, plans out austerity and service of the cows as the means by which gods would be pleased, and being omniscient would give him the knowledge suited to his gotra and Śākhā. Here austerity is clearly laid down as the means to attain knowledge. Even where traditional knowledge cannot be imparted, austerity can help one to attain from gods what men cannot give. This is the mystical message of supreme importance for which, absence of the knowledge of gotra is dealt with in the text. It is clear that Śrī Śaṅkara has correctly grasped it while the moderners have misconstrued it. The direction towards austerity had come from Gautama. So Satyakāma considered him to be the final authority to find out whether the knowledge attained was right, complete, or otherwise. Thereby, the

aspect of 'Faith' (श्रद्धा) is also emphasised as one of the prime importance to avoid misconception and misrepresentation of mystic visions. One is reminded of the Catholic practice of verifying the visions by the father-confessor. Even a Joan of Arc, or a Francis of Assisi or a Brother Lawrence or a Thomas A. Kampis has to go to his Father-confessor to determine the correctness or otherwise of his mystic vision.

Śaṅkara, explaining Gautama's question, does not refer to varṇa. He is specific in saying that the knowledge of the tradition of the disciple (विज्ञातकुलगोत्रः) is necessary to direct him towards a spiritual goal or to choose a deity (इष्ट). When a child is born in a family, he learns and absorbs certain spiritual atmosphere. A true guru, even today, directs him by the path which is in accordance with his taste and temperament, or else one may direct wrongly. Satyakāma had not gone to gather mere bookish-knowledge, as is clear from the rest of the story, but had gone for the specific purpose of attaining wisdom about the Divine Being. In the West, even for the diagnosing the disease importance is given to the family doctor, for he knows the hereditary aspect. So the question and answer here are not to know the social position of the student, but to know the spiritual heritage. Due to the absence of such specific knowledge, Gautama had to resort to a tortuous route, viz. austerity, just because of the absence of this specific knowledge. Thereby it is laid down that all spiritual knowledge must be imparted after knowing the spiritual environment and heredity of the disciple. Therefore the new sects that impart one mantra or meditation to all, irrespective of their development in spiritual knowledge, are acting against this Vedic dictum.

Śaṅkara says that it was Vāyu divinity who entered the ox, thus it spoke out as a human-being. In historical times Saint Jñāneśwara made a buffalo recite the Vedic lore. Naturally, such mystic visions can hardly be explained in a material sense, but then this is true of all spiritual knowledge. The Swan, according to the master was the Sun divinity, and Madgu the Varuṇa divinity. The famous ṛk refers to the Sun as; 'हंसः शुचिषद् वसुरत्तरिक्षसद् होता वेदिषद्' etc. The fact remains that Satyakāma had the visions and received the Wisdom as a result of austerity. In spite of this, he knew wisdom attained through a guru only was fruitful. This shows the greatness of his character,

#### AGNIVIDYĀ

Satyakāma became a preceptor in due course. Upakosala, the son of Kamala studied under him, tending his fires for twelve years. Satyakāma regarded him worthy of spiritual knowledge, so though he sent away the other students, yet, kept him back. Satyakāma's wife told him that since Upakosala was devoted to the fires, they may be annoyed by this act of Satyakāma; but he just went out of station without paying any heed to his wife's warning.

Being afflicted with mental worries due to non-graduation and the subsequent problem of future life, Upakosala did not have his food in spite of the request of Satya-

kāma's wife. Satyakāma knew that such worry would bring about the needed concentration on the Iṣṭa, viz. the fire divinity, and thence the mystic revelation would take place. It is shown here that muchless the disciple himself, even a wife of a realized soul, cannot understand his behaviour, though it is always for the benefit of the disciples. This was exactly what happened. All the three fires, pleased by Upakosala's devotional service, austerity and faith, were filled with pity (grace) at his predicament. They came and taught him the Divine truth that vitality, ether and bliss together are the Supreme. Upakosala said, 'I clearly understand that vitality is Divine, for that is the cause of life, but I am unable to understand how bliss that is momentary, and ether which is inert can be Divine. The fires explained that they (i. e. bliss and ether) were to qualify each other. Thus, all pervasive joy is Divine. It is clear that the upaniṣad is trying to assert that life can be made divine only if it is lived in order to give joy to all, selfish life is demonic, so is the life of misery or what causes misery. This is the purpose of life, laid down in a nutshell. The meditation is not on happy sky, but on all three simultaneously, as Śaṅkara points out clearly.

Having explained to Upakosala the main teachings, each fire further gave him the due about further meditation upon themselves. Gārhapatya taught that earth, fire, food and sun are his forms. Earth is the object of sun, and food, that of fire. But the Divine person in the sun is identical with Gārhapatya fire, Purī points out that these are the two couples of food and eater, thus constituting the caturmūrti concept of meditation. In later Viṣṇu-worship, Vāsudeva etc. are meditated upon as the Chaturmūrti. The seed of these Vaiṣṇava concepts is found here.

Next, Anvāhārya fire taught him that water, directions, stars and the moon are its forms. Just as Gārhapatya is to be meditated as the Divine person in the sun, Anvāhārya is to be meditated in the moon. Water and stars are the food here and the directions and the moon are the eaters. It is interesting to note that Śaṅkara points out that it is well known that the moon lives (shines) by the light of others. He neither gives any similarity nor any Vedic passage to support this. Thus we can easily assume that it was an established fact as much as his other illustration that water produces food-stuff. The editor very rightly points out that this meditation is conducive to enlightenment, because the fruits of this meditation declare that it destroys all sins which obstruct enlightenment. Even if the son of such a meditator does not perform the last rites, the meditator attains to the abode of the Supreme.

Finally Āhavanīya fire taught him vitality, space, heaven and lightning as its forms to be meditated upon by identifying it with the Divine person in the lightening (Indra). Heaven and space are the food here, being the location for the others. As the editor notes, according to Nyāyarakṣamaṇi, this meditation done properly leads to the abundant availability of the necessities of life along with the unbroken lineage of the body and the mind.

Then the fires told Upakosala that the meditations taught earlier were self-meditations while the ones taught later, fire-meditations. The results of these meditations would be taught to him by his preceptor, Satyakāma.

When the preceptor returned, he exclaimed, just as his own preceptor had done earlier, that Upakosala seemed to have realized the Truth. On enquiry, the disciple answered that the fires who seemed to be so silent then, had themselves taught. It to him. After finding out what had been taught, Satyakāma said that they had taught what brought results, but he would teach Upakosala that knowledge by which, no sin would taint him just as water does not taint the lotus. He taught him the meditation about the person in the eye, to whom all that is good comes, and which shines in all that shines. One who realises Divinity thus taught, attains the highest state.

This episode, like the previous one, asserts mystic realization of the Divine. The earlier one emphasised nature and action as the catalytic agent, while this one emphasises devotion to a particular deity as the agent. Here, Sun, moon and lightning in the outer world are identified with the eyes in the internal world. The *Iṣṭa* or the Divine Being in both cases is fire, thereby indicating a strain of succession in mystic visions. That is why it is difficult for a worshipper of one deity to guide a worshipper of another. On close analysis a lot of mystic knowledge is revealed in these stories as presented in the Upaniṣad.

#### MEDITATION TO COMPLETE SACRIFICES

The Upaniṣad goes on to prescribe a type of meditation which completes any uncompleted sacrifice. The sacrifice is to be identified with God. Śaṅkara makes one of the most astounding observations here by saying that whatever moves purifies or cleanses. On the other hand whatever is stationary is impure. What moves on, thus gets rid of the faults hence is pure, what remains motionless is never purified. Thus, Śaṅkara is a prophet of continuous movement, though he is often identified as a preacher of status-quo. Purī says that sacrifice has motion or action as its material cause. Śaṅkara points out that voice given to proper pronunciation along with the mind given to proper meditation is what constitutes the sacrifice. Thus he puts the ritual in its proper perspective, and gives us the true clue to it as Brahman meditation. Other commentators speak of it as a part in the morning worship. The importance of Vyahṛti-homa is told. Purī and Giri assert that the one who understands the real meaning of the Veda is able to remove all the faults of a sacrifice due to this knowledge. The Brahman needs no purificatory ceremonies. Only an ignorant person is touched by sin, not a knower of the Truth.

Śaṅkara derives the word 'mānava' from 'mauna' or 'manana'. Thus by human-being he means the one who is indrawn. The speechlessness is due to his analysing the truth from the untruth continuously. Such a one is fit to become Brahman, and only he can protect the sacrificer from any harm due to non-performance

or wrong performance of the sacrifice. The Upaniṣad definitely emphasises in this context that unless a realized person is there to supervise, the sacrifice leads to undesirable results. Mere ritual is not sufficient to save anyone.

#### VITALITY AS THE HIGHEST

In the previous chapter better meditations of the advaita type that lead to the Supreme Divinity directly were taught. The gr̥hastha, saṁnyasī or naiṣṭhika brahmacārī having faith, but incapable of worshipping God as non-different from self, and yet given to the proper conduct of their duties are taught meditations, their results, and paths. In these meditations first the Prāṇa is described as the eldest, speech as the the Vaśiṣṭha, eyes as the foundation etc. Śaṅkara observes that a good speaker defeats these who possess other faculties. Thus, from ancient times, speaking was emphasised in Hinduism. The different faculties, once fought for superiority. Prajāpati guided them to decide it by an experiment. They should go one by one, The highest would be the one whose departure would kill the body. Purī points out that this was done so that the pride of others would not be hurt. A principle is laid down here that one should avoid annoying others if it can be helped even for a good and honest purpose. The same idea eventually finds expression in Gītā : 'by, whom none is annoyed, is the realized soul'.

All the faculties left the body one by one for a period of year. But the body lived as deaf, blind, lame, dumb, insance etc. When vitality was about to leave, all of them realized their dependence on it, and asked it not to leave. They said that all their goodness was due to it. Thus vitality is expressed through all the senses and the mind. Whatever is food, is food for vitality. One who has realized this will not have anything unedible for him. Since food should be covered by water at the start and finish of a meal, water is sipped, Purī observes that by using *an* (Animus) in place of Prāṇa, the śruti is stating that all actions whether burning, drying or floating, are done by the vitality. This meditation was taught by Satyakāma to Gośruti, the son of Vāghrapāda, and he at that time proclaimed that if it was taught even to a stump, the stump would become full of leaves. It is interesting to note that Vyāghrapāda is associated with śaivism and specifically with Cidambaram where śiva is worshipped in the form of Naṭarāja. It seems that Naṭarāja is a symbol of vital force as presented in chāndogya. Daharopāsanā is also associated with chāndogya and Cidambaram. There is a very close connection between these and Naṭarāja worship,

#### MEANING OF SATYAKĀMA'S LIFE

It is also interesting to note that Satyakāma is first presented as a student, then as a teacher; and last as a man of renoun whose association is considered praiseworthy for the Vidyā. As a student one ox and some lean cows were presented to him to make them multiply. The ox represents the main theme which was to be co-ordinated with



all the other knowledges (ज्ञे) to make it complete. The other knowledges, being worldly, are emaciated. This shows the way of knowledge. As a teacher he considered lack of devotion as an impediment to knowledge. So he nurtured it in Upakosala. Now he is expressing his experience in non-attached karma, because lotus is represented here. Thus all the three developments of his personality are shown here.

#### SACRIFICE TO ACQUIRE WEALTH WITH GREATNESS

A specific rite is prescribed for attaining wealth, as virtuous acts depend upon material wellbeing. Śaṅkara remarks that wealth flows down only towards greatness. Wealth may be attained without greatness, but then it would be prone to vices. Thus, this rite is not for those who desire wealth for sense-enjoyment, but for those who want to attain great moral heights. Śaṅkara prescribes that a householder should earn only with scrupulous moral means. A society which is not conscious of this results in decay. Excessive neglect of wealth is as harmful as neglect of morality and vice versa. The present world has a great lesson to learn from this, Jaina or Bauddha neglect of national wealth had given a lesson to us at another historical juncture. Poverty leads to easy corruption, but then one must remember that poverty is both—material and mental. Excessive addiction to sense enjoyment leads more and more to mental poverty, even though one may have material wealth. Mental poverty equally leads one to become an easy prey to corruptions. Modern India is a good example of this.

#### MEDITATIONS ON FIVE FIRES

Śvetaketu, the grandson of Aruṇa, went to the parliament of Punjab. Pravāhaṇa, the son of Jeevala asked him whether he had learnt from his father, the following : where people went after death, from where they spring forth; the junction of the two paths of the mere ritualists and the meditative ones; the reason why the other world was not flooded with people; and the order of sacrifices that eventually end in the last rites as the sixth sacrifice. Śvetaketu did not know the answers, and so was made fun of by the king. He returned to his father and complained that he had graduated him without completing proper education. Here he refers to the king as a rascal or the one who is not a true king, thus showing the same temperament of fault-finding which he will be showing in the next chapter also.

Āruṇi of the Gautama lineage, Śvetaketu's father, explained to him that even he was ignorant of the answers to these questions. He was thus not capable of teaching him. He had not purposely kept a secret. Āruṇi was not egoistic, so with his disciples he went to the king and enquired the knowledge in public. The king did not like to part with the knowledge as, until then, it was only the kings who possessed it, and it made them the rulers. Yet, he could not refuse it to one who was worthy of it. This is to clearly lay down that knowledge must not be kept away from a worthy enquirer. At other places it has been laid down that a person who does not impart knowledge to a

proper disciple, gets the sin of killing an embryo. An embryo is in the womb of the mother just as the knowledge is in the womb of the person. He asked Āruṇi to stay there for a year, or until he was fit to receive the knowledge. This shows that knowledge should not be imparted until the disciple has stayed with the preceptor and is ready to attain it by acquiring the pre-requisites.

There is a lot made out of this incident. Many have tried to establish that it was the warriors who first possessed the knowledge of the Divine Being. But it is clear that the knowledge referred here is that of the five-fires, rather than the Divinity. On the contrary, in the very next chapter, Āruṇi is going to teach the Supreme Divine knowledge of the self as the first cause who is identical with the active soul. The point made here is, on the other hand, that even a man of the highest realization should not fight shy of gaining auxiliary knowledge, nor should a higher caste person avoid gaining knowledge from a lower caste one. In Gītā also the succession from Āditya to Manu to Ikṣhvāku etc. refers to the succession in the warrior class or the kings. It was not the Divine knowledge, but the auxiliary knowledge which was helpful in running a nation, hence more fitting to be taught through kings. Śaṅkara of course takes ruling only in the sense of teaching this particular knowledge, but he does not deny its well known meaning also. Ruling involves many cruel and heartless acts. A king has to deal with people who commit the five great sins. The fruit of this fire-knowledge is that the knower does not acquire sin by these acts of associations, and remains pure. This, then, is the reason that this knowledge was first and primarily given to kings not to the brahmins who needed it not.

The heaven is the fire, sun is the firewood, its rays are the smoke, day is the flame, moon is the embers and stars, the sparks. The gods offer faith as oblation in this fire and attain the realization of Soma, the King (Śiva with Umā is Soma).

Again, rain is the fire, wind is the firewood, cloud is the smoke, lightning is the flame, thunder is the embers and rumbling (or hail), the sparks. The gods offer devotion to Soma as oblation in this fire and attain the realization of the rain. Śaṅkara suggests that faith having turned into the form of Soma, turns into rain. The idea is that having faith in Śiva leads to raining kindness upon all beings. The Śaivāgamas often assert that service of Śiva-bhaktas is true service to Śiva Himself.

Again, earth is the fire, year is the firewood, sky is the smoke, night is the flame, directions are the embers and mid-directions, the sparks. The gods offer rain and attain the realization of food (objects of senses). The idea is that out of the kind acts done to others the true enjoyments of sensuous nature follow. Though one may attain objects for selfish purpose, they will not yield enjoyment.

Further, male is the fire, speech is the firewood, breath is the smoke, tongue is the flame, eyes are the embers and ears, the sparks. The gods offer food and realize the

semen (i. e. the power of the mind to realize bliss). According to Hinduism, mind is a product of food. Hence great emphasis is placed on food for even spiritual culture. The dichotomy of body and mind, or matter and spirit, was never accepted by any branch of Hinduism, just as their identity, or even dependency is totally denied by the semetic religions in all their branches. Buddhism emphasised the importance of spirit and deduced matter from it, or even denied it. Jainism emphasised dependence of mind on matter. Thus Buddhism's spiritual life emphasises mental culture or dhyāna, while Jainism emphasises fasts and food restrictions, all of which come under physical austerity. Sanātana Dharma has always kept itself equidistant from both. Indulgence and anchoritism are both denied by Yājñavalkya, Vaiṣṇava, Kṛṣṇa, Śaṅkara and other great Sanātanists. They accepted interdependence.

This has been derived from the Chāndogya-Upaniṣad where it is laid down that food leads to bliss.

Finally, female is the fire, lap is the firewood, passion is the smoke, penetration is the ember, and the total happiness, the sparks. The gods offer semen and attain the embryo. The buddhi is regarded the female principle which is the fire into which semen, the mental power of bliss, is offered. Unless one is able to renounce rasa or enjoyment of mental equilibrium by intellectual disassociation, one cannot enter the Divine Being in its Real Essence : 'नास्वादयेद्रसन्तत्र निसङ्गः प्रज्ञया भवेत् ।' One has to discriminate, that is think rasa also as an impediment (उपमन्त्रणा) while being in the lap of the female principle, i.e. in the spritual Umā or Śruti. One has to let this penetrate deep within to produce the knowledge of Śiva in its embryonic form, i. e. the indirect perception since the result of this meditation is not liberation here, but is the attainment of the estate of Śiva. One must at the same time comprehend that the universe moves on the wheels of sun, clouds, rain, food and progeneration by males and females which are associated with faith, devotion, kindness, mental and intellectual generation leading to God-realization in an indirect way. This is one of the most important meditation for householders. The embryo grows lying in the mother's womb for nine or ten months; similarly the indirect realization lying in the intellect grows through discrimination, disassociation, mind-culture, body (sense)-culture, renunciation, toleration, concentration, confirmation, intense love for the Divine Being (9) or in some cases, contemplation into direct realization. In case the purpose here is accepted as mere birth, the passage should be construed to teach dispassion for the cycle of birth and death. But Śaṅkara hints at the real meaning by indicating the state of embryo as one in which the powers of mind, body, senses, brilliancy or the cohesive strength, individual consciousness and creative force are all obstructed. Once the true direct perception is manifest one attains to these. A mere child is far from possessing these qualities of independence. True independence, without the realization of one's own self as Śiva is impossible. The child lives for life, and once dead is offered to the fire i.e.,

cremated, because it was out of fire that he came out in the order told above. Of course, direct realization also, after the exhaustion of *prārabdha* or life-force, becomes one with the Divine Being. Here the Upaniṣad lays down that Brahman-knowledge is eventually absorbed by Brahman. There have been other views holding that *Brahma-jñān* being a product of ignorance is sublated by the knowledge. Still others hold it to be of the fifth category, i.e., neither Brahman, nor its absence, nor both, nor indescribable. But the simplest thing is to regard it as being identical with Brahman being of the nature of knowledge. In all other knowledges since the association is with some product of ignorance, ignorance continues, but here since ignorance or its product is not the object, it is destroyed and thus only Brahman alone remains.

Those householders who practise this meditation along with discharging their duties, and also those practitioners who are *vānaprasthas* and *saṁnyāsins* given to faith and austerity, go via the divine route to the supreme Divinity. The others who are merely given to Vedic rituals, social service and charity go via the route of manes to become the food of gods or senses. These who do not even perform good deeds are born here and now as animals etc. Thus, the other world is not over-flooded. The dead ones go to three different routes. The king taught Āruṇi the route which is irreversible, the three routes and the five fires in full detail.

Śaṅkara in one of his masterly expositions points out the superiority of love or non-violence, truthfulness, simplicity, celibacy and such moral qualities in comparison to all the complicated Vedic ritualism. Those who are partial to friends, harbour animosity against the foes, and indulge in physical or mental violence due to it, are given to crookedness. They are impure by nature in their mode of life, and thus can never come up to the standard of required purity for attaining the higher state of Divine Bliss. Faith in the Divine Being and austere living resulting from renouncing the immoral life that brings physical comforts, is truer path. The statements here are clear to indicate that whether modern age or ancient, wealth is always acquired by questionable means. Thus when a moderner feels that moral standards have gone down, he forgets that it is so because physical comforts have become necessities, and austere life has been renounced by a greater number of people than before.

Giri makes an astounding revelation that living in a village means living with a wife. Hence living without a wife is living in a forest. Śaṅkara says that food is any object which is a means of enjoyment. He quotes a Vaidic passage which declares wife, animals, servants etc. as food. He further says that even though a wife is a means of enjoyment, yet it does not mean that she does not enjoy. Likewise while the souls are food of the gods, they also enjoy the play. Actually even the senses use the individual for their own ends, so to say, the soul also enjoys the game. Another important observation is made by the great master that nothing is totally destroyed. Destruction only means becoming unmanifest in a particular time and clime. To a believer in existence,

Purī points out, no total annihilation of any thing makes sense. Thus advaita stands in complete opposition to those who believe everything comes to naught at some time. The passage here is a rare specimen of deep intuitive knowledge which Śaṅkara sheds on many mystical topics. Often being found in the midst of a logical discussion, its importance is lost sight of but it is exactly these passages that guide an aspirant to a total view of Reality. Similarly, there is a lot of eschatological information supplied here by Śaṅkara which, he points out, is really meant only to bring out the dispassionate attitude of the mind towards life and death.

#### VAIŚVĀNARA

We saw Uddālaka Āruṇi in the previous section as a lover of knowledge. This section also paints him as one given to gather knowledge. He is also humble enough to acknowledge the greatness of another teacher even when he knows quite a bit about the subject. The universal self has heaven as the head, sun as the eye, air as the breath, space as the body, water as the bladder and earth as the feet. He is to be meditated in one's heart. This is one of the highest meditations, hence it is put just before the ultimate teaching of 'Thou art That' by Uddālaka Āruṇi, in the next chapter, to his son Śvetaketu. Śaṅkara says that to avoid going to transmigration, the Vaiśvānara must be realized as the real eater :

Upamanyu's son Prācīnaśāla, Puluṣa's son Satyayajña, Bhāllavi's grandson Indradyumna, Śarkarākṣa's son Jana, and Aśwatarāśva's son Buḍila were rich in having large buildings and were also great masters of the ancient lore. Once they got together to find out the nature of the Supreme Divine Being who is indifferent from the individual being. Non-difference emphasises that neither the being who is limited by the body nor the Divine Being as the Sun, Viṣṇu etc. the object of enquiry.

They were not able to realize it, so they decided to go to Uddālaka Āruṇi, who was at that time famous as the greatest authority on the Universal self. But he thought that he was perhaps not in a position to teach such great ones. So he directed them to Aśvapati, the son of Kekaya. Bhāskara makes out that this was done to point out the importance of social work in association with the realization of the Universal self. But Purī rightly condemns this view by pointing out that here it is merely meditation that is being taught, and not the self-realization which alone leads to renunciation of all actions. He asserts an important doctrine of the way of knowledge by saying that even a non-realized aspirant commits no fault by having faith in his being identical with the supreme Divine Being. Such faith is not egoistic in as much as it is a mental mode taught in the scriptures as good. The object of this knowledge is true, and Kṛṣṇa and other teachers have taught that even a little of right faith leads to the highest. Austerity, pilgrimage, charity, recitation or japa etc. are far inferior to even a touch of the practice of the way of knowledge.

After paying proper respects, king Aśvapati offered the ṛṣis money etc. which they refused. Thinking that they doubted his royalty, he said that in his realms there was neither a thief, nor a miser; nor a non-worshipper; nor an illiterate; nor a libertine. This is an important passage to indicate what according to Hinduism constitute the aims of a government. He further requests them to stay on for the sacrifice he was going to perform, and witness it. He further promised that whatever fees he would give to the priests, he would also give them. But the ṛṣis told him that the purpose of their visit was to study the nature of the universal self from him.

The king enquired from each one what he had realized and found that they had only realized one part of the whole. So he told them about the Real which is all-pervasive. The Upaniṣad conveys the idea that each worshipper when questioned could point out only a partial view. It is not by denying what he had reached that one can lead him higher, but by showing that it is a partial view. Thus Sanātana Dharma is not conversion by denial as the other religions are, but by offering the greater truth, which includes the lower one. That is what Ajātaśatru did in each case. He also indicated that in whichever form the Divine Being was worshipped, it gave the worshippers joys of life, like food, along with special favours according to the adjunct which was worshipped, following the dictum that one attains what one worships. He also pointed out that by not realizing the whole, the part that had been attained would have also been lost, emphasizing thereby the importance of the whole. To misconstrue a part as the whole is the way to ruin. Thus, Sanātana Dharma does not believe in many ways to reach the Divine, but in the harmonious amalgamation of all of them; nor does it believe in many gods, but in all the gods being parts of the Divine Being. Śaṅkara points out that when one realizes this, he no more enjoys an object like the ignorant who regards only his body as his self, but, on the contrary, knows himself as the enjoyer in all the bodies and minds as the Universal self.

As an accessory to this, one should transform his eating into worship. He should think of his chest as the place of sacrifice, the hair as the grass, the heart as the household-fire, the mind as the cooking-fire, and the mouth as the offering-fire. The first morsel is to be offered to Prāṇa, satisfying the eyes, sun, heaven, their abode and the self. This endows one with children, animals, health, brightness and eminence. Similarly the second morsel is for Vyān which satisfies the ear, moon and directions and gets the same endowments as the first offering. This is similar for all the rest too. The third morsel is for Apāṇa, satisfying the speech, fire and the earth. The fourth is for Samāna, satisfying the mind, rain and lightning. The fifth is for Udāna, satisfying skin and space. One who meditates thus becomes as virtuous as the one who feeds all beings. All his sins are burnt away. Even if he gives his left-over, to a pariah which is a prohibited act, it becomes a sacrifice. Śaṅkara points out that except the actions that began this body, all other actions are burnt away and that by feeding such a one, one gets the virtue of feeding all beings.

### ŚVETAKETU VIDYĀ

It was postulated earlier that all the universe is born from, sustained by and annihilated in the Supreme Being. There the process was not laid bare. In the previous section it was asserted that by feeding a realized soul, all beings are satiated. This is possible if only one being is present in all. To assert this identity and explain the creation is the aim of the present chapter.

Śvetaketu, the grandson of Aruṇa, though capable did not join a seminary. As in their lineage, all were brāhmaṇs by right, not merely by birth, his father asked him to join one. He went at the age of twelve and studied the four Vedas with their meanings upto the age of twenty four, and returned to his parents. His father, as we have already seen, was humble, though rich in knowledge. On his son's return, he found the young man extremely proud of his knowledge, having no respect for others. Āruṇi, finding his son unlike himself or a brahman, wanted to teach him the right conduct. So he asked him whether he had enquired how his teacher that knowledge which makes one omniscient. Śvetaketu was wonder-struck and enquired from his father about that knowledge was possible. This knowledge can be had only from a realized soul, hence Rāmānujācārya and Madhvācārya have misconstrued this passage. But the editor has shown the fallacy of their interpretations in a very constructive way. Purī has also demonstrated the irrelevance of Bhāskara's interpretation.

Uddālaka asserts that just as by knowing the nature of clay, iron, gold etc. all their modifications are known, so also knowing the Real one becomes omniscient. It is the clay etc. that really exists and all its modifications are merely name-sake, hence unreal, though useful for purposeful activity. In the same way by knowing the nature of the Real which is the cause of the universe, the whole universe becomes known. Abhinava Nārāyaṇānandendra points out that one may construe the passage in two senses. Just as by touching the tail of a cow one is supposed to have touched the cow, similarly by knowing the base or the material (cause) one is supposed to have known the thing. Or, since the material (cause) is the essence, knowing it means knowing the whole. If it be said that ignorance of form is ignorance of the thing, then it can also be asserted that the knowledge of the material (cause) is knowledge of the thing. Similarly an intelligent man accepts a gift of the juice of sugar-cane as a gift of sugar-cane. Thus it is clear that form is not being ignored, only the reality of the material cause is being asserted. Greek philosophy has also been quite busy with the problem of form and matter. Plato has followed the Upaniṣadic assertion. Purī very cleverly demonstrates the reason that ignorance, inertness, misery etc. being materially one with existence are themselves effects, hence not the cause of the universe.

Śvetaketu, though humbled to a great extent, was still haughty enough to put the blame on the ignorance of his teacher rather than realize his inability to understand

the inner essence of the Veda in absence of right conduct. Śaṅkara, anyway takes a more humanitarian view that fear of another long journey made him speak thus. But even then the derogatory remark does show his lack of good behaviour.

Uddālaka first pointed out the primacy of 'being' in preference to the other view of 'non-being'. Thus we find that seeds of Buddhism are inherent in human nature. The editor, in his masterly notes, has brought out all that has been said about the manifestation from 'Being' in the Brahmasūtras, along with pointing out the six traditional basis to determine the purpose of the chapter, as asserting the identity of the individual and cosmic soul.

The comments of Śrī Śaṅkara here are similar to those in the Aitareya-upaniṣad. He points out that though the Being even now is alone for the wise, yet to an ignorant the liveness is not clear. Prior to creation it alone existed. He takes the occasion to analyse the causality of non-being threadbare, and shows basic inconsistencies in that view. The Upaniṣad asserts that the cause of the universe is only the Pure, Unmixed Being. This Being reflected (i.e. contemplated) about growing forth and becoming many, and as a result the elements came into being. Since It was thus both the material and the efficient cause, all other contrary views are non-Vaidika. Śaṅkara declares that Vedānta denies the non-being of anything at every stage, and asserts the being even in non-existence. The order of creation is not intended to be conveyed here so, one should not make much ado about it. Each form is taken by the Being, and it is the Being itself that is the creator at every stage.

After the creation of fire, water and food, the Upaniṣad goes on to tell us about the living beings. Here Śaṅkara makes a very scientific observation that the body is the seed and not the egg, since bodies can maintain the species without the eggs. Thus does he hint at the now well known Darwin's theory of evolution which holds that changes in the body result in changes in the species. The well-known controversy of the primacy of the seed of the tree is solved here in a mystic utterance. Puri says that the Upaniṣad does not directly assert that the individual souls were produced. Since the Universal self itself in association with the body-mind complex appears as the individual self. Just as a jar is created, not the jar associated-space, similarly the complex is created, not the individual self. Thus in case of souls only the contact (संसर्गाध्यास) is assumed, and not creation (स्वरूपाध्यास). Śaṅkara takes recourse to the analogy of the image in a mirror to clarify that Śiva remains unconnected with the creation as Himself, though as jīva he is associated with it. The editor has brought together the scattered ideas of the reflection-theory, in this context, in his notes.

The Supreme Divinity entering fire, water and food, divided each in such a way that each had half of its own and a quarter of the other two. Thus the observable fire is half fire, a quarter water, and a quarter food, making the whole. In this way all was included in all, the difference mainly being of the quantity. Having thus associated, the



Divinity brought forth varieties of names and forms. Since associated with the created, the Pure Being produces variety; this is the creation by the individual self. Purī points out the dilemma of an advaitin; if the world be unreal, he becomes associated with Buddhism, and if it be real, he becomes associated with the dualists. The answer is very well provided by Śaṅkara himself. All behaviours and manifestations are real being identical with the Real, and unreal if thought of as independent of it. Thus Vedāntic conception of the world is neither real, nor unreal, but unreally real and really unreal.

The external objects, are categorized in the above manner to indicate the process by which an aspirant should think of them. The red form is that of fire, white that of water and black that of food. Analysed thus, there is no light as such. In all the molecules, there are atoms of elements. If all of them are separated, there is no molecule. In all the atoms there are electrons and protons. If they are separated there is no atom. Similarly, one has to discriminate in all objects. The sun, moon, electricity and all such things can be analysed by the same technique. Though one may wonder that the categorization excludes touch, sound, etc., yet Śaṅkara holds that since all sensations are in a thing that has form, by analysing form, everything else is covered. The ṛṣis of yore claimed that they knew all by knowing the Being in these manifestations.

### Food

Uddālaka continues to explain the triad nature of things. Food, when eaten, changes into faeces. This is from its worse part. The flesh or body is from its middle part. The mind is from its subtle part. Śaṅkara informs that the subtle portion enters the hita nerve via the heart to form the mind, Thus the mind is physical, though it is capable of experiencing subtle things. This śruti gives the lie to Gautama and Kaṇāda who hold the mind to be eternal and non-physical.

Similarly, water becomes urine, blood and vitality. Fire in the form of oil, butter etc. becomes the bone, marrow or the lubricant in the bones, and the voice. Śaṅkara raises a relevant question that those animals who do not take the respective food, water and fire are also found to possess the mind, vitality or voice, hence the assertion here seems to be irrational. The answer, he says, is that since all basic things in nature contain all the other basic things, a special power is assumed in these animals to draw out those small portions that are present in them. As a further illustration he parallels the butter extraction from curd. Śvetaketu was still not convinced of the food as the material cause of the mind. So his father asked him to abstain from food for a fortnight. After that period when he was asked to recite, from memory, the Vaidika passages, he was unable to do so. But after a sumptuous dinner, he was able to recite it all. This demonstrated that if even a spark remains after the fire is extinguished, it can light up a firewood, the soul also flares up the knowledge if the sixteenth part of it remains, and is then nourished by food. This made Śvetaketu realize that the mind is a product of food.

This is an important doctrine of Hinduism which has given us a vast literature on the effect of food on mental culture. Kṛṣṇa has also divided food into those which help longevity, give physical and mental strength, and bring about health, happiness and love; those that lead to misery, sorrow and disease; and those that are prohibited, leading to hell. Manu, and later on the Purāṇas have given detailed instructions on this topic. One may differ in details, but the principle is sound. The present day science of nourishment has little, if any, knowledge, about the contribution of food towards mental culture. It emphasizes merely the physical well-being.

#### SLEEP

The mind is the adjunct of the individual self. When it is not active, the individual loses his differentiation from the Universal. Uddālaka thus wanted to introduce Śvetaketu into the esoteric doctrine of unity. The editor has here pointed out very rightly the inner contradictions of other commentators. Śaṅkara says that just as on removing the mirror the reflection enters the object, meaning thereby that only the object remains, so also on removal of the mind in deep sleep, the Supreme divine Being who had entered for differentiating name and form, alone remains. In this stage, therefore, all tiredness is removed. Even a diseased person feels better after a good sleep. Uddālaka illustrates his point by a bird tied to a string. After trying to go in all directions, and being unsuccessful in getting away it gets tired and eventually returns to rest on the very rod on which it was tied with the string. Similarly the mind after enjoying the fruits of its actions in the waking and dream states, returns to the Divine Being tied by the vital breath. Thus the mind though transcending the vital, is yet rooted in it.

In further elucidating the root, the external food is also alluded. Prāṇa is individual, and food is cosmic. A person is hungry because the water has taken away the food by digestion. Now, food is rooted in water, which in turn is rooted in fire and that is rooted in the Divine Being. In this way all beings are rooted in It. Both prāṇa and Anna are rooted in it ultimately. At the time of death, speech is merged into the mind, the mind into vitality and vitality into fire. The last sign of living is heat in the body. Fire is absorbed in the Divine Being. If the mind has attained the mystic vision, the individual soul no more returns to the world of Becoming. Abhinavanārāyaṇānandendra points out that in deep sleep due to the presence of Prāṇa, unity is not clear, but in death, it is clearly manifest. Though it seems that all will attain to the Divine Being at death, yet by holding on to the untrue or the Becoming, they return to it. Just as prārabdha in the form of Prāṇa is the cause to bring back the soul from the deep sleep, ignorance or the conviction of one's nature as Becoming brings one back from death.

Uddālaka declares that the ultimate mystic doctrine is that the 'true' and subtle essence of this world, the Divine Being, is really one's own self. He tells his son, 'The Divine Being is your own self.' This emphasizes the Divine Being as the human soul.

Body, mind etc. are *his*, but not himself. One has to separate the chaff from the corn prior to the esoteric or sophic vision. The Jaiminiya Brāhmaṇa clearly says that when the soul reaches the Divine Being, it is asked 'who the soul is?'. If the reply indicates a person or a family, it is subjected to the law of Karma. If the answer is, 'The same light as you', it is given entry into the sophic vision.

Śvetaketu wondered, like all of us, why everyone did not know this, if it were so. Uddālaka explained that though honey comes from various flowers, yet it knows not its origin, so also though all entered the Divine Being in deep sleep, in death, and even at the end of every mental modification, yet they do not know of It as their origin. On entering the Divine Being a lion, a worm or a mosquito becomes one with It unconsciously, yet comes back into the form which it is destined for because of ignorance. 'You are', he told Śvetaketu, 'That true subtle essence—the Divine Being.' The editor has brought together the views of Madhva and Rāmānuja in this topic, and has pointed out the discrepancies in a short but rational note. Abhinava Nārāyaṇānandendra quotes a passage from Vidyā-Prakāśa, that makes the idea clear that the ego associated with consciousness had studied the Veda, but Śvetaketu was its witness. As soon as Śvetaketu heard it he had the Divine vision. Here Śaṅkara remarks that a passion ( भाविता वासना ) is not annihilated after even a thousand yugas. He further says that just after getting up from a dream in a distant land, one remembers the place one went off to sleep, similar is the case here. Uddālaka says that just as rivers entering the ocean do not realize that they came out of it in the first place, so is the case here. Purī says that as the rivers are naturally unconscious, so are the individual souls naturally ignorant. Abhinava Nārāyaṇānandendra makes a case against some interpreters who take the illustration in the sense that Gaṅgā, Narmadā etc. cannot be discriminated in the ocean, so also the souls cannot be discriminated in deep sleep.

Śvetaketu wondered that when the waves, bubbles, froth etc. go back to their source, i. e. water, they get annihilated. Does the individual self, when it goes to sleep or death, is similarly annihilated or not? Obviously not. How, then, could it be postulated that they were identical? Uddālaka answers by the illustration of a tree. If a tree is hurt by an axe the juice flows out, but the tree is not destroyed. Even if a branch is cut, the tree still lives on enriching itself by the manure and water. The cut-branch dies, for it has lost contact with the soul. Similarly the eyes, mind etc. die when the soul leaves them. Even the body dies. But the soul lives on. This is proved by the knowledge of a new-born in sucking the breast. Śaṅkara says that drawing of nourishment is controlled by one's prārabdha. He further points out that the Buddhists, Vaiśeṣikas etc. hold the plant as insentient, but that is wrong according to the Vaidika illustration here. Purī offers an inferential statement to support this view. It is interesting to note that the śruti even credits the plants with joy—the joy of living. Some of the most modern discoveries support this view. If young plants of a species are often crushed below an old tree of the same species, the latter starts dying out.

Śvetaketu further wanted to know how the differentiated gross forms came out of the non-differentiated pure Divine Being. Uddālaka wanted him to observe the philosophical truth as allpervasive in every day life, and thereby develop a scientific attitude of observation. So he asked his son to bring a fruit of a fig tree. He asked him, then, to break it open and observe it. He saw the seeds which were again asked to be broken and observed. Now he could see nothing. Uddālaka told him that from that nothing, which is simply unobservable something, came out the big observable tree with all its branches etc. This had to be accepted on faith. The lesson to be learnt here is that faith is not a blind belief, but a reasoned belief. It is also to be noted that the final particles that we break anything into, whether molecules, atoms, electrons etc., are always unobservable and non-differentiated even in everyday life. Similar is the case with the final cause—the Pure Being. ‘That subtle essence’, claims Uddālaka, ‘is the real self, that is you, Śvetaketu’. Abhinava Nārāyaṇānandendra points out that though Śvetaketu had not seen the tree coming out of the seed, yet rationality demanded its acceptance. In the same way no one sees the universe grow out of the Divine Being, yet rationality must force one to have faith in its acceptance. Śaṅkara points out that though reason and tradition leads one to this conclusion, yet if one is addicted to enjoy external objects, his mind will not be concentrated enough to understand the subtle reasons, unless one has great faith in what is being discussed. Thus, according to Śaṅkara, faith is that which makes the mind concentrated on the intended meaning. In this way, it is clear that faith of Hinduism is entirely different from faith of the other religions. In fact Hinduism basically views faith as a commitment to One’s own rationality based on experience, rather than a belief in a creed or dogma. Faith is not believing in the absence of a proof. It would merely mean another’s view on a subject, if it were so. It is the conviction born out of reasoned belief in one’s own experience (अपरोक्षानुभूति). A Hindu’s faith is not perceiving through another’s eyes, whether a prophet, massiah or ṛṣi.

Uddālaka further elucidates that even though a thing may be present it may not be experienced by one sense, and yet might be experienced by another sense. He asked Śvetaketu to bring a crystal of salt and put it in a jar of water. The next morning he asked him to see the jar and report if he saw the salt, he himself had put in it. Śvetaketu, naturally could not see it. Uddālaka then asked him to taste the water from all sides. On tasting, he could see the salinity permeating through and through. ‘Similarly’, explained his father, ‘Brahman, though present through and through, cannot be experienced through the senses or the mind, and yet It can be perceived as thy own self.’ Uddālaka gives another illustration to indicate the way the Divine Being can be experienced. An abducted person whose hands and feet are bound and is lying in a forest, is crying for help as he cannot help himself. But if released and directed, he can find his way by asking the villagers he meets, and reach home. Similarly the teacher and the scriptures release the individual soul from the bondage of searching outside, and

show him the direction of 'I' as the way. Searching within, being rational he reaches the destination. Śaṅkara considers the Divine Being as the home and, the chains as the desires for possessions. Puri explains that though the sentence asserting the identity of the individual soul, i. e. jīva, and Śiva alone is the direct cause of Knowledge, yet the Veda points out some extra benefits the accrue from having a preceptor. Without him there would be none to confirm that right meaning of the text. A person for whom even this is not sufficient, thinking and reasoning over the meaning of the śruti texts may be necessary. At any rate, the assertion is made that delay is only as long as the body lasts. A realized soul, after death becomes one with Śiva. Śaṅkara discusses the difference between prārabdha karma and the rest of the karmas and decides that the former can be exhausted only by enjoying (i. e. experiencing) the results, while the others are annihilated by Knowledge.

Thus Uddālaka taught in various ways that consciousness is indivisible and animates both the individual and the universal. 'That art Thou' is an axiom, the esoteric teaching which has universal application and must be verified and proved in all fields of life. Uddālaka further taught the concept of synthesis through honey, water etc., pointing out that the one who sticks to his individuality treads the route of relative values, while the one who identifies himself with the Universal self gets liberated.

Now the steps of liberation are demonstrated in a scientific manner. The dying person recognizes his relatives. He reports it until the voice is merged in the mind. Mind merges in vitality, which in turn merges in fire, and that in the Divine Being. Once the merging is complete, nothing is felt. This is true of all whether enlightened or unenlightened, but the former due to the dawn of the Knowledge, is not subjected to birth. This Divine Being is the real self. Śaṅkara points out that only those who have psychosis of a particular loka, time, fruit, etc. can go to these, but as the enlightened one has no such illusions, he does not go through any route. Even the ignorant goes according to his deeply impressed psyche. The realized soul has only the Divine Being deeply impressed in his psyche. That durable Being is pointed out as the real being of śvetakatu. In an earlier passage the same steps of death were told to indicate that both, the ignorant and the enlightened have Śiva as their being. Here it is restated to tell us that the enlightened does not go through any route, but is absorbed here and now. Abhinavanārāyaṇānandendra points out the other implication that the enlightened one, after entering the Divine Being, loses all differentiated consciousness. He also quotes a smṛti which says that since the knower has become all pervasive, how can he leave one spot and enter another.

Finally Uddālaka gives the illustration of a thief who, due to his addiction to immorality, burnt his hand in the fire-ordeal of a police station, whereas a non-thief attached to morality is saved in the same fire ordeal. So also, the one who regards the body-mind complex his own is a thief and due to his addiction to physical and mental impressions he is burnt again and again in the world of sorrow. On the other hand, the one who knows the Truth does not get burnt although living in the body-mind complex. That

birthless, deathless, fearless Śiva is the soul of Śvetaketu. Śvetaketu attained the grace of Śiva as a result of Uddālaka's blessings, and tasted the Divine Being.

Śaṅkara sums up the chapter by saying that prior to the knowledge of the Real, the soul is caught in the vortex of cause and effect relationship. The teaching of the Universal self removes this ignorance, and thus bereft of divisive sophia, he tastes the indivisible Śiva-consciousness. Here it is not a meditation like the one previously presented in the Sun, woman or image as the Divine Being, but a statement leading to direct realization, removing the illusion of oneself being the soul associated with the body-mind complex and tied to causal relationship. He also rejects other views that accept identity by proxy. Abhinava Nārāyaṇānandendra gives a detailed analysis of 'The Sun is Brahman' etc. and shows how 'That Thou art' is of a different species. In this way, in this one chapter the truth is taught in all its totality in a very organic manner and it is no wonder that the import "That thou art" is the most often used all over the world when describing Hinduism and also in most of the Advaita texts.

#### BHŪMĀ

In the last chapter, mainly the Divine Being was taught. Now, to help those who do not have the required intellectual grasp, those things which are very near the Divine Being will be taught, slowly leading the aspirant to the final goal. Thus Śvetaketu-Vidyā is for the aspirant with the highest qualification, while Nārada-Vidyā is for the average aspirant. Śaṅkara gives some alternative reasons also. Even though all knowingness was declared a result of the knowledge of Śiva, famous things like name, meditation, truth, vitality etc. associated with the Divine Being were not separately mentioned. Hence one may doubt the omniscience of a realized soul. This chapter is to remove this doubt conclusively. Gradual-teaching from the grossest to the subtlest leads to easy understanding. Moreover the final truth serves him all the more when contrasted with mediatory truths. It should, however, be clearly understood that the teaching is not about a different being.

Nārada a divine seer, even though a great scholar of noble descent, well-qualified and having a good conduct did not get out of sorrow and misery because of lack of self-realization. It is clear that without it, none can attain Bliss. He approached Sanatkumāra, a seer well established in the vision of the Supreme Being, with humility, in spite of his greatness otherwise. Like a good teacher Sanatkumāra asked him what he had learnt so far. Nārada gives a wonderful list of subjects worthy of being an encyclopedia, the four Vedas, history, cosmology, grammar, spiritualism, mathematics, godly wisdom, ethics, politics, martial sciences, astronomy, medicine, mythology, folklore, logic, physics, demon-exorcism, materiology, mining, dancing, music, phonetics, philology, metres-fine arts, etc. This clearly shows that additive knowledge is never wholesome. Finite may be increased by accumulation, but it can never become infinite. Nārada requests Sanatkumāra to guide him away from verbal knowledge to the Divine knowledge,

for he was still subject to sorrow. He was also aware of the fact that on attaining a glimpse of the Supreme Being, sorrow becomes a non-entity.

Sanatkumāra says that all that Nārada had studied was merely words. Words cover the whole range of things hence things are not real as compared to words. So he told Nārada to meditate on the words as the Divine or consider them a Symbol or an idol of It. This was the meditation on name. One who realizes this becomes independent as far as the name goes.

Nārada wanted to know if this was the last word about the Divine Being. Sanatkumāra said that speech, mind, will, thought, meditation, comprehension, power, objects, water, fire, space, memory, hope, vitality, truth, understanding, faith, steadfastness activity and joy successively are higher leading to infinity. Here 'higher' refers to higher for meditation, hence the order is not logical.

Without speech, right and wrong, good and bad lose their meaning. Thus it is clear that animals bereft of speech cannot be subjected to the law of karma. Hence speech is one of the most important elements in evolution. The mind holds both, speech and name as its object of experience, hence it is more pervasive, hence a higher symbol of the Supreme Being. It is the mind which makes the soul feel the actor and enjoyer. The will is still higher. Inorganic substances have mechanical movements, the organic (animals and plants) move due to stimulation; but in human beings, the same takes the form of will, utterance of speech, reflection in the mind are all done when one wills to do it. The whole creation is but an effect of the Divine will. Therefore will is a higher symbol. Here Śaṅkara points out, incidentally, the Vedāntic view that all actions are ordained by mantras, as compared to the Vaidika view that it is the Brāhmaṇas which ordain actions. The Upaniṣad clearly supports the Vedāntic view. Abhinavanārāyaṇānandendra has discussed the problem in detail. He also points out that the will is of greater importance than the action as such. Śaṅkara says that such a meditator becomes endowed with wealth, children etc. for his own enjoyment, not for that of others, as that fruit is reserved as the fruit of later meditation (उपासना). Abhinavanārāyaṇānandendra, anyhow, differs and maintains that similar fruits may result from different meditations.

Thought is higher than will. Even a learned man is nothing if bereft of it and even an unlearned one is served as a learned one if he has thought. Thought is to be meditated as the Divine Being. Thought is here defined by Śaṅkara as the power to think as the occasion rises, considering past and future along with their purposes. This becomes the main instrument for willing. Purī illustrates, that a man thinks, 'Food was capable of satisfying me in the past. So it will serve the same purpose in future'. Hence he wills to eat.

Meditation is still higher. Meditation is uninterrupted flow of thought on the Divine Being. Purī points out that thought is in direct proportion to meditation. A

meditator, being bereft of an agitated mind, becomes still. Even if one practices only partial meditation, one attains greatness in wealth, knowledge and other qualities. All good men are given to meditation. Greatness brings depth and firmness. Those who are devoid of any greatness remain quarrelsome, fault-finders (चुगलखोर) and abusively slanderers. Great men are those who have repose, firmness and are established. Here it is clearly being enunciated that those who are incapable of acquiring even worldly prosperities are by no means fit to attain the Highest. Since meditation leads to these, it is to be thought of as the Divinity. Those who attain greatness become great teachers, kings etc.

Comprehension is the right and wholesome knowledge of the subject for that alone leads to meditation. All the knowledge is to be comprehended. Śaṅkara remarks that good and bad are known by usage in a given society. Thus, not only tradition but local usage is also important. All this has to be correctly comprehended. By meditating on comprehension as the Divine, one goes to where comprehensive people stay. It is thereby suggested that getting the company of the wise is by no means easy.

Strength is higher than comprehension. Strength here is the strength to react properly to an occasion, and is the result of ingestion. Body (or physical) strength is also included here. Even hundreds of comprehensive persons tremble before a man of strength. Śaṅkara illustrates that a hundred wise men tremble before a majestic elephant. Only a strong person can serve the teachers and become their favourite. Going near them with concentrated mind, he continuously observes and listens to them. Thinking over their teachings, he realizes and acts accordingly, attaining the proper result. Abhinavanārāyaṇānandendra points out that it is really the mental power as perseverance which becomes manifest as bodily strength. This strength is Divine.

The subtle element of food that becomes the mind is higher than strength, for it is the cause of the latter. Therefore a man who remains hungry over a period of time, even though he may live, loses his power of observation, understanding, activity and eventually sense-perception. By ingesting food again, he slowly regains these faculties. Thus the Veda is particular in pointing out that a hungry man is a curse to society, and a society which permits people to starve, soon degenerates. By meditating on food as the Divine, one is able to have enough food for social good.

Rain makes people happy because it results in increased production of food. Hence water is superior to food. Heat and lightning bring rain, hence are higher than it. Meditation on light brings radiance and freedom from darkness to the devotee. Darkness here also includes ignorance, avarice etc. Space is still higher because it is its cause. Sun, moon, lightning, stars, fire etc. are all in space. It is due to space that we can talk, listen, play or feel depressed due to separation from the beloved. Even plants grow towards space. Meditation on it leads to spacious state of existence, where there is less rush causing difficulties to each other. This is a good lesson to modern town planners.



Memory is greater than space for it is memory that makes space useful. If one does not remember, even space cannot be utilized. It becomes nothing even though present. In one of those rare passages which seem to support solipsism, Śaṅkara says that there would be no space without memory. Abhinava Nārāyaṇānandendra tells of an earlier writer who holds that as the memory of the creator is the cause of space, hence the memory referred to here need not be individual memory. Without memory none is able to understand of what all others speak in a conference. Nor will one be able to think over it, much less comprehend it in its absence. Memory is necessary even to recognize one's children. This is also a mental modification.

Hope is still greater. One memorizes hymns, performs sacrifices, produces children, desires heaven, all because he has hopes. Meditation on hope as Divine leads to all prayers being granted.

From name to hope, everything was connected with the cognitive faculty of the self. Now starts the active faculty of the self, for thereby the enquirer will be led to meditation on the egoity. All the cognitive faculties are tied to vitality, hence it is higher. Vitality is one's parent, teacher etc. It is that which enters the body to reveal the world while vitality or life-force is present. If one even speaks unbecomingly to one's parent or teacher, one is called their killer, but after vitality departs, even on burning them, no one is accused of murder. Meditation on vitality as Brahman makes one an excellent speaker. Vitality is the all-pervasive Divinity that controls all the activities of the body and mind; according to Śaṅkara, this is specially being indicated here. One who has attained this state should not deny his excellency, for that would amount to denying Divine excellency. Pride in the body-mind-complex is bad, but not in the Being. Abhinava Nārāyaṇānandendra points out that one should not be disturbed by those who try to disturb one's peace of attainment by raising irrational doubts. Gauḍapāda has also said; having attained, one should not unnecessarily try to question one's experience. (समप्राप्तन्न चालयेत्)

Having heard the supremacy of vitality, Nārada reached the destination, or so he thought. Hence he asked no further questions. But since a good teacher does not leave his disciple, even if satisfied, in a false contented state, so Sanatkumāra, of his own accord, taught him further. It is clear that vitality is the manifest Divine, while one must transcend the manifest to reach the Truth. Since unmanifest, being unmanifest, cannot be enquired into, therefore only one who knows It can lead an aspirant on these dizzy heights. That leading is, basically, the contribution of the teacher. All that is unknown is generally categorized into the known categories, thereby one, so to say, misses the boat to gain penetrative depth of the Absolute. Hence, only the one who has experienced the Absolute can say that it is a new discovery, and not an old category. Abhinava Nārāyaṇānandendra points this out by saying, the ultimate is being disclosed now in the new section.

Sanatkumāra said, 'Not he who has realized only vitality speak about the final Truth excellently, for he knows it not; but the one who has had a vision of the final Truth alone speaks of the highest excellency'. Hearing this, Nārada requested him to guide him into that highest excellency. Sanatkumāra asked him to enquire the Truth, for then only he could speak about it. On being thus asked, Sanatkumāra started teaching him.

Understanding is necessary for Truth, hence one should understand the understanding; that in turn depends on thinking, so one should understand the thinking; faith is necessary to think, so faith is to be understood first. Faith is the result of earnest attention and service to the spiritual guide, in order to attain the Divine Being. But that faith is also to be understood. Being active in sense control and mental uniformity one becomes steadfast. One is active in these disciplines only if one obtains joy, for no one can ever be active without being happy. This joy is also to be enquired into. Here the first plunge is taken that it is only infinity that bestows happiness.

Śaṅkara points out that though in the Veda sometimes even objective reality is called the Truth, yet that is only because it is a means to attain the Truth. Thus Vedānta considers anything right if it leads to Truth. This is what has given so many means (प्रक्रिया) to attain the Divine Being. Puri quotes a fine verse meaning that realized souls see and feel in every thing and situation Śiva. Abhinava Nārāyaṇānandendra says that whatever an enlightened one speaks is always the truth for, being of the very nature of truth, even future is controlled by him.

In every case the Upaniṣad emphasizes the enquiry and understanding. This is what is called 'tapas' or austerity in the Taittirīya-upaniṣad. Śaṅkara points out that attaining joy in future, i. e. aiming at it, is being happy. It is seen that a person aiming for a son, kingdom etc. acts joyously. Thus all these steps, lead to the truth which is also Bliss, hence Bliss is also to be enquired and understood.

Infinity is that where empirical dualities are no more. Where one does not see, hear or understand anything different from oneself, that is the experience of infinity. Observation of duality is finite. Whatever is finite, is mortal. On being questioned about its roots, Śaṅkara says that the infinite has Its roots in It's own greatness. Little ones have roots in something different from themselves. This is a great lesson for all. Anyone, or anything rooted elsewhere can never give joy. Thus, if the government of one nation is rooted in another nation, it is slavery; if the economics of one nation is rooted in another nation, it is bonded labour, and so on and so forth. Really speaking, of course, infinity is not rooted in anything. Śaṅkara points out that it is not like the greatness which is attained due to property, wealth etc. All such greatness is merely dependence (परतन्त्रता) leading to misery.

Śaṅkara says that desire is the cause of sorrow, and finite things always lead towards more desires. Hence the finite is always sorrowful. Since we always find in

the world,—that all joys are due to some external situation or object, so we expect the roots of the infinite joy also elsewhere. But in infinity, joy is not due to anything external and it is so because the infinite is of the nature of joy. Sleep is the illustration here as pointed out by Abhinava Nārāyaṇānandendra. The editor has given the Vaiṣṇava interpretation of these passages and shown their irrelevance in this context.

Since the infinite is rooted in nothing else but itself, the Upaniṣad says that It is below, above, behind, in front, north, south, etc. Veda means passage everywhere. To show that It is the same as 'I', the whole passage is repeated in terms of 'I'. Since 'I' may refer to the body-mind-complex, the Upaniṣad repeats the same about 'self'. Without 'I', the directness of the realization will remain turbid. Seeing, thinking and understanding this, one gets pleasure, delight, union and joy in himself. He becomes self-governing or autonomous (स्वराट्, कामचार). Ignorants are heteronomous, governed by others (अन्यराजा), dependents and slaves. Their gains are perishable, depending on the illusionary philosophy they hold. They cannot move in all states of experience (लोक) as they like. The wise man remains independent of all external situations, and remains unattached to whatever chance may bring him. Though even in the portion where meditation on vitality was explained, its fruits had been declared in a similar way, yet it should be understood that there the fruits were relative and not absolute.

The Upaniṣad further declares that such a wise man derives everything out of himself. His vitality, hope, memory, space, fire, water, appearance and disappearance, food, strength, understanding, meditation, thought, will, mind, speech, name, mantras, activity are all from his own self. The idea is that all that were traced to the Pure Being are all traced to the self to indicate their absolute identity. It is clearly said that an enlightened sage is identical with the creator and all his behaviour (व्यवहार) is from his own self. Dualists cannot stand the very idea of such identity but to a non-dualist it does not create a problem as pointed out by the editor. This view is supported even by the mantra. The sage experiences neither death, nor illness, nor sorrow. He knows and obtains everything everywhere. He is one before creation, and during it, he is three, five, seven, eleven, a hundred and eleven, twenty thousand and many. At the end again, unity persists. Purī points out that all that is obtained by the upāsana of the qualified Divine, is automatically attained by attaining the unqualified Divine.

At the end of his teaching, Sanatkumāra describes the pre-requisites of this wisdom for an aspirant. Just as the face is clearly seen if the mirror is shining and spotless, so also the Divine is clearly experienced if the mind be pure. Therefore the mind is so be made pure. This depends upon food. Purity of food leads to purity of nature which makes memory firm. Firm remembrance releases one from ignorance. To such a one whose stains of avarice etc. are wiped out by detachment, knowledge etc., Sanatkumāra (in the form of a Guru) shows the Beyond. Sanatkumāra is the same

as Skanda. Śaṅkara says that the nature of the soul is his mind. Food refers to all the perception by the enjoyer in enjoyment. To enjoy all experience without aversion, attachment and delusion is the purity of this food. This leads to unshakable conviction which is like memory. This is not like continuous remembrance as believed by the others. Such continuity is impossible as long as one lives. Realization of Advaita is not a new phenomenon, but is like 'regaining' a necklace, which is in the neck, but is forgotten. When pointed out by someone else it is regained. Hence the word 'memory' has been used.

Quoting Bhāskara's interpretation that by pure food here the Upaniṣad means avoiding garlic etc., which are impure as substances; those given by impure people which become incidentally impure; infected foods which are contactually impure and foods that are stale which are impure due to time, Purī condemns it severely. He states very rationally that purity in one locus cannot remove impurity in the other locus. Thus food which is pure for the nourishment of the body cannot cause purity in the mind. Swallowing, munching etc., he points out, actions of the Prāṇa, but their enjoyment and perception belongs to the individual self. One cannot eat without knowing. Hence whatever food or other objects are brought by chance should be accepted without attachment or aversion if one desires purity of the intellect.

Abhinava Nārāyaṇānandendra refers to the Paurāṇika episode in which Pārvatī asked Sanatkumāra to be born as her son. He attained the final Bliss there by being taught by Śrī Dakṣiṇāmūrti himself. Even to-day the Nirañjanī Akhadā (निरञ्जनी अखाड़ा) of Śaṅkara's Daśanāmī order has the pontiff who belongs to the Dakṣiṇāmūrti tradition. Thus up to date there is a historical succession to this episode. This is to point out the absolute dependability of this mystic teaching which in essence is that spiritual Bliss is the basis of all actions and is attained by freedom by stages. The Divine is the source of all power.

#### HEART ĀKĀŚA

After establishing the absolute Being as the universal principle and its realization as the highest value, out of compassion for ordinary people who are incapable of comprehending that which is beyond time, space, causation, etc., and since without its comprehension, the aim of human life remains unachieved, the Upaniṣad starts this chapter, in which meditation of the heart is taught, which leads to the same goal as propounded earlier. Similarly, though the Divine Being is beyond all imaginations, yet, since ordinary people desire some imagination to hold on to, the Highest is asked to be imagined as the Being whose wishes and commands come true. Celibacy is to be ordained for those who are not naturally inclined to it. Similarly, achieving the final departure through the Suṣumnā is to be prescribed. This, in a nutshell, is the last chapter.

Śaṅkara points out that bereft of all adjuncts the Divine Being seems a non-entity to persons of ordinary intellect. Even the ruling philosopher of western culture,

Hegel, could not comprehend Spinoza's 'substance' and criticized it as such. This indicates the reason for the 'nirguṇiyā' saints of Hindi literature and the whole of Sikhism to be based more on this compromised view of the Divine Being, than the pure metaphysics of Śaṅkara. Since ordinary people cannot comprehend the metaphysical Real, they are given the second best : the Real as conceived with good qualities, pulsating as the universe and directing the human self. This serves as a preparation to wisdom. This is exactly what Śrīkaṇṭha, Rāmānuja, Śrīkara etc. teach, but unfortunately they or their disciples deny the final wisdom. Thus, following the Upaniṣad, Śaṅkara accepts these, but he also accepts that which is beyond these. His devotional literature is for this very purpose and is dedicated to the then prevalent deities as the representatives of the Divine Being.

Śaṅkara mentions 'a special type of ignorance' as the adjunct of a Wise, i.e. realized soul. This 'speciality' later took the form of a stage, or a power, or a fragrance, or a shadow, or a remainder of ignorance to posit the stage of the liberated soul. Abhinava Nārāyaṇānandendra tries to indicate that Śvetaketu-vidyā determined the being (सत्) of the Divine, Sanatkumāra-vidya determined the bliss (आनन्द) of the Divine and now the consciousness (चित्) will be determined. The editor, in his notes, has pointed out that this meditation is to be associated with Bṛhadāraṇyaka, Kaivalya, Taittirīya and other such Upaniṣads which treat of the heart-meditation. This meditation is very popular among the monks of the order of Śaṅkara even to-day, and is a must for those who belong to the tradition of Śrī Dakṣiṇāmūrti. Abhinava Nārāyaṇānandendra's disciple wrote an extensive work on this. The Sūtasamhitā also has a complete chapter devoted to this topic. Vidyāraṇya treats this in his Anubhūti Prakāśa. As Śaṅkara points out, this meditation makes people have faith in the Divine Being. Through this faith they will reach realization.

The body is the temple city of Śiva. There is a small lotus-like 'home', the heart, in which there is a small space which should be directly perceived, for it is there that Śiva is revealed. Śaṅkara explains the simile in details. He says that the heart is an idol, like Śaligrāma is idol of Viṣṇu, for it was in this that the Being entered as the soul, just as Viṣṇu enters the Śaligrāma by the confirming ritual (प्राणप्रतिष्ठा). An aspirant bereft of worldly desires intent on withdrawing the senses and the mind, observing celibacy, truthfulness etc., through this meditation realizes Śiva in it. Moreover, space is not to be taken literally, It really means that the Being is bodiless, subtle and all pervasive like space. This space is as vast as the external one containing the impressions of all that was, is and will be. Concrete manifestations decay but not the type, (जाति), since they give rise to future sequences. Moreover when purified, the mind there reflects the absolute. Now, if all this exists in the body, then when it decays or dies, all will be destroyed just as on the destruction of a container, that which was contained is also destroyed. But just as the space covered by a jar is not destroyed by the destruction of the jar, so also this space is the city of the Divine and not the body which was so

called only euphemestically. It is death-less, sorrow-less, and sin-less. Its desires come out true. Our desires condition our future, just as the desires here on earth determine our purposive actions. That which is resultant is perishable. Hence only those who have realized the self attain permanent Bliss.

Abhinava Nārāyaṇānandendra brings out the purport of this passage, basing it as he does on the unimpeachable authority of Prakāśātman. Here the identity is not established in the individual and universal self by denying activity etc. in the self. But even while accepting the difference between the two, the universal is to be meditated in the symbol of the individual ego. The only difference from the other symbols is that they are different from the ego while here it is ego itself. The other difference is that while this symbolization is metaphysically true, the others are only religiously so. Hence the Vaidiks or non-Vaidiks, all may practise this meditation. Even the qualities that are enunciated here to be meditated are clearly metaphysical and not at all religious, or united to any particular deity, sect, time or clime.

For the one who has realized this, out of desires or formative tendencies, the desired spheres come into being. His mere will brings about his association with his father, mother, brothers, sisters, or friends. If he desires an experience of perfume, food, drink, vocal or instrumental music, women, or any other objects, he attains it by mere will. Being pure like Śiva, his desires are fulfilled giving him supreme enjoyment and greatness. Śaṅkara points out that none can obstruct his will.

The editor's notes have collected all references on this topic found in the Brahma Sūtras. The Upaniṣad goes on to lament that inspite of this hidden treasure within one's reach, people still go after untrue external food, sex and other enjoyments for they are hidden under the cover of ignorance. Just as an ignorant owner walks over his field again and again everyday without discovering the hidden golden treasure, so also men pass their lives using the ego, without knowing the hidden treasure there. In our own times, the great Ramaṇa Maharṣi mostly emphasized this finding out of one's hidden treasure. Actually, the ego oriented to Śiva (knowledge) is will, and oriented to Aśiva (ignorance) is action.

After giving imaginative interpretations of the Hṛdaya and Satya, the Upaniṣad goes on to describe the self as the bridge. When one crosses it, the world and its miseries cease. The experience is ever illumined. For those who desire to attain it celibacy is necessary celibacy is extolled as the greatest sacrifice, individual and collective; greatest meditation, fast, forest-dwelling or austerity etc. Celibacy in Śaṁskṛta is brahmacarya (ब्रह्मचर्य) which literally may mean living for Vaidic study or the supreme God-head; or living in or living as the supreme God-head; or even living as guided by the supreme God-head. In doing all these, one has to give up the passionate cravings for anything except Śiva. Thus it is a far more comprehensive concept than merely abstaining physically from sex. Since in the sex-act the semen flows out, it is alluded that any mental flow through the instruments of perception and action due to a passionate desire, is non-celibacy (अब्रह्मचर्य).

Thus Śaṅkara first explains the word 'brahmacarya' as giving up of the passionate craving for 'women', but soon changes it into 'women etc.' to include all passionate cravings. The first is to emphasize that being born as we are out of the sex-act, it is in the very fibre of our being. It is the most universal and uncontrollable craving. Freud is covered by this sentence. But the great followers of Freud like Adler, Jung etc., soon discovered that the human being is far more complicated than assumed by Freud. Hence Āchārya Śaṅkara, the great master, posits that any passion which is equally intense as the sex-passion, is an obstacle. If we can have passion for nothing but the Truth, only then is it revealed. After all, It is being ever revealed, but the passionate impressions deflect it to the objective name and form. Thus the impassionate alone are fit to have the final vision of the Being as It is, bereft of all Becoming.

Śaṅkara goes on to remark that celibacy is itself a worship of the Divine Being, because it is identical with making It the only desired object. In this he puts the paths of yoga and bhakti as alternative approaches to the Universal self. As long as one seeks happiness outside the self, one cannot make the self the object of desire, for desire is always directed to what is conceived as happiness.

Abhinava Nārāyaṇānandendra quotes the Purāṇa which says that control of the mind is the flower with which the Being is worshipped. A celibate has unlimited freedom in all the worlds. Śaṅkara says that the objects experienced by will though mental, are yet real. They are not to be dismissed as false. He also points out that it is the mental form of ocean, earth, Himalayas etc. that go to Brahmaloḥa as told in the Purāṇas. He further declares that even the so-called material objects are mental in as much as they are born merely out of the will of the Divine Being. Similarly dream objects have a reality of their own. They are unreal in relation to the waking state which in its turn is unreal in relation to Śiva. He further makes an astounding metaphysical revelation that mental and physical objects are in consecutive cause and effect relationship. Physical objects make mental impressions which in turn, direct physical activity, and so on. Thus both are the same and equally true in terms of the self. What is suggested is that the Being in its universal form is continuously interacting with the Being in its individual form. The universe is only the resultant of this action-reaction-complex. Hence the uniformity of the objective world is due to the fact that the universal self, being one, acts similarly on all individual selves. At very few places Śaṅkara has so openly enunciated this mystic doctrine which really bridges the physical and metaphysical domains. Thus the objects, though mental, are real in the Brahmaloḥa, and since they are born out of Pure will, the enjoyment is also limitless and true. All objects, thus, according to Advaita are real including the dream ones. All objects shine equally non-different from knowledge.

The Upaniṣad goes on to describe nerves as those in which the sun's rays enter, which extends to the other world on the other side. One wonders there is some connection being hinted between the universal and the individual. Unfortunately the

commentators are not explicit. In sleep the soul attains this contact. At death, one enters the sun and thence through its rays, enters the next life. This is the aesthetological view. If the sun is taken as the Divine Being, then of course it is that which activates the nervous system and through it, the thinking. In sleep, one is atoned. At death, it is absorption in It and then coming out according to previous actions and intentions. Śaṅkara asserts that Prārabdha can touch only the one who is in identification with the body-mind-complex, and not the one who is established in the real self. Thus he gives the clue that the more one practises this meditation the less is he subject to pain.

#### PRAJĀPATI VIDYĀ

Prajāpati declared that the sinless, ageless, deathless, sorrowless, thirstless and true-willed self is to be understood, for its knowledge leads to the attainment of all the worlds and desires. This declaration was heard by all. Indra and Virocana were sent to learn it by the gods and demons respectively. Śaṅkara is at pains to point-out that the knowledge is to be attained *here* and *now*, hence it is different from heaven which is *then* and *there*. Therefore only restrictive injunction 'niyamavidhi' can be accepted here and not laid injunction 'apūrvavidhi'. Purī makes out meditation and knowledge, both as the purport of this section. Both Indra and Virocana were great emperors and full of worldly joys. They went to Prajāpati to live in all humility. This shows the greatness of this knowledge. No joy is greater than the knowledge conveyed here. They served him for thirty-two years. It is the greatness of this knowledge again that bitter enemies, renouncing their jealousies, aversion etc., stayed together without fighting for so long a period. If one can renounce these immoralities, just to gain the knowledge, it is clear that one who has attained it will be bereft of them. When Prajāpati asked them the purpose of their service, they both said the same thing. Prajāpati told them that the person who is observed in the eye is that self. Prajāpati meant the observer, but the disciples took it as the observed. Śaṅkara says that a disciple should neither be hurt nor discouraged, for these lead to a feeling of inferiority, suppressing further enquiry. Hence the śruti wants to lay down that as the enquirers of the Divine Being were so few and far between, they must be encouraged with love. The greatest miracle of self-knowledge is love, the rarest commodity, in the world of infatuation and attachment. The intense flame of love is the bunsen-burner test of a realized saint. Thus the blame of some modern thinkers as well as those of the middle ages, that it was unfair for Prajāpati to let his disciples misunderstand, is ridiculous. He teaches them further to make the point clear. If he had left them without any further light, then he could have been blamed.

Prajāpati asked them to see in a pail of water and report if the self was not completely revealed. Embedded deeply in the body-consciousness they said that they saw the whole of it clearly. To make them understand their folly, he asked them to shave, put on robes and ornaments and once again look into the pail. They again reported themselves as having clearly seen the self-adorned, dressed and tidy, Prajāpati



again told them that the self was the immortal Divine Being. Shaving should have easily indicated that the body considered as the self, had changed. Putting on the clothes also could have given them the clue. It should have been natural to ask how the perceptually changing body was immortal. But they had no such doubt. This shows that unless one is fit to acquire wisdom, no amount of teaching will make him wise. Thus the fault lies in them and not in Prajāpati that they could not grasp the self. Mistaking the body as the self, they departed. Prajāpati was trying to point out that the body is subject to change, hence cannot be the self. But they were so much enmeshed in the concept of the body's self-hood, that in spite of being taught in many ways, they stuck to the illusion. As they departed, Prajāpati lamented, 'Here they go without becoming wise, Whoever follows the doctrine of the body being the self, even if he be a god, will come to misery.' Virocana went and spread the doctrine that the body was to be well-preserved, well-served and made happy. This would make one attain the Highest here and hereafter. According to this doctrine, the hereafter is the fame that remains after death. It is interesting to speculate whether the Egyptians, Assyrians, Babylonians etc. who preserved the dead bodies well anointed, may not be descendants of the Asuras.

Prajāpati repeated the qualities of the Atman, so that Indra and Virocana may try to correlate their knowledge with their goal, and enquire the true self. He also felt that they may, in future, remember and ponder over what was taught and then realize the True Self. The point to be noted is that the self cannot be taught without associating it with some adjunct. Hence it is by variously changing the adjunct suitably, that the adjunctless can be conveyed to the disciple. The temporary association with them can be indicator leading to perception. Prajāpati made the body the adjunct, and suitably demonstrated the change in it while the self remained the same. But the folly due to excessive attachment prevented the illumination of the two kings.

Indra had better qualification for wisdom, than Virocana. While returning to heaven he meditated upon Prajāpati's words. It dawned on him that if the body be the self, then the self would die, get mutilated etc. This would render the doctrine as useless. So he returned to Prajāpati and told him what he felt about the knowledge acquired. Prajāpati was happy and agreed with him. He asked Indra to remain in waiting for another thirty-two years. This shows that unless purified by serving the preceptor, mere teaching never leads to wisdom.

After thirty-two years, Prajāpati taught the self as moving about in dream. Indra left, but soon returned to report his problem. Though the dreaming self is free from bodily defects, yet unpleasantness, weeping, and even death are experienced in dream also, rendering this knowledge of the self also useless. Prajāpati agreed and again asked him to stay for thirty-two years. Till now the objective and subjective experiences of the self have been shown to be non-self. Thus all external and internal experiences have to be discriminated from the Real self. Now it remains to be shown that the absence of such experience is also an adjunct. So Prajāpati said that the self

is that what is asleep, serene and dreamless. Indra started for heaven once again, but felt unsatisfied because when there is no perception of objects, real or unreal, even the subject seems to be annihilated. Prajāpati heard the problem and agreed that the undifferentiated consciousness of sleep cannot be the self. It is but false. Infinite quietistic trance is not accepted by the Veda as the true and final freedom. Indra was asked to stay on for another five years, making his discipleship a neat a hundred and one years' period. If it took the king of gods that long, one should not feel disheartened if one finds it difficult to grasp or attain the Supreme Beatitude even at the cost of dedicating one's whole life. It is worthwhile.

Mortal is the body whose substratum is the self. As long as one identifies oneself with the body, pleasure and pain are unavoidable. But no sooner one knows one's bodilessness, they cannot touch him. Like the air or the clouds which are bodiless, he enjoys laughing, playing, sex, friends, chariots as a mere spectator, not identifying himself with the body, for the relation is only accidental. He uses the senses and the mind as mere instruments. Even the gods are masters of the worlds because they understand and meditate on this self. This is the final preaching of Prajāpati.

In this way, a progressive idea of the self is presented here. The Divine Being can not be grasped in one leap, but by methodical endeavour and steady deepening of the intellect. Introspection leads to the pure spirit which is the ever-shining subject even when there is no knowledge of any external or internal object.

Śaṅkara says that the body is accidental, due to virtue or vice, but the self is causeless blissful existence. He further reveals the esoteric mystery that desires and objects in the pure māyā always leads to joys by fulfilment. Purī supports this by saying that purity means unassociation with virtue or vice. Such a one is connected with Maheśvara in identity.

Some old commentator, identified as vṛttikāra by Purī and considered as an Advaitī by Ānanda Giri, and who may be Baudhāyana of Rāmānuja, takes that the first three teachings relate not to the supreme, but to the shadow etc. to lead the disciple by stages. Śaṅkara criticizes it as it is against the spirit of the Veda. He further points out that the 'Uttamapurūṣa' or 'Puruṣottama' taught here is the subtlest and most difficult topic in the Veda. Thus the great ritualists, logicians, atomists, naturalists, intellectualists etc. have made blunders trying to realize It by their own efforts. They have equally failed to understand the Veda by unaided intellectual pursuit. The great Ācārya declares that only those who have renounced all desires for externals and taken complete refuge in the Divine self, only those *paramahamsas* who are given to continuous meditation of the upaniṣads and not those who stick to rules of the order, can grasp and teach this knowledge.

Bodilessness is really seeing the body as different from self, rather than physically becoming separate from it, which would just be another name of death. It is this

bodilessness that leads to the attainment of the Supreme Divinity and not death. In the fifteenth chapter of *Gītā Śrī Kṛṣṇa*, who is associated with this Upaniṣad as pointed out earlier, gives a brilliant exposition of *Puruṣottama*. Here it is explicitly told that the illumined person sees himself enjoying as Indra and other beings, but never identifying himself with anyone. A pertinent question is raised whether he also experiences the miseries of human beings and others. The answer is a positive 'No.' Śaṅkara observes that these experiences are due to ignorance, which has been annihilated by Knowledge. But the enjoyment of those whose minds are faultless is a result of Knowledge. It is this which is experienced by the enlightened sage. But even then the objects are not experienced as different from one's own self. Thus we can easily see that it is these passages which have led Abhinavagupta, Somānanda, Vasugupta and others of the Śaiva religion to postulate Bhairava realization on the one hand, and Vallabha's concept of changeless transformation on the other. All this is due to over-emphasizing the experience in the life of a *jīvanmukta*, rather than absolute metaphysical assertions of the Upaniṣad. Some others, again, have tried to minimize the importance of these mystic super-conscious experiences. That too is taking the logistic view rather than an existential one. But Śaṅkara and the others who strictly follow him, see both the faces of the coin with equal clarity. The sage is not an automaton, but is the perfect master of all that is existent. Thus the purified mind, as Śaṅkara points out, can perceive all objects, including subtlest transcending time or space. All pure objects desired by him are attained by his mind by the power of its own will, independent of anything else.

Indra went and taught this to the gods who enjoy the fruits of this knowledge to this day. Even those who intuitively perceive this now, will attain the same state of existence. *Kenopaniṣad* also says that Indra was the first to learn and teach to the gods the secret doctrine. Thus it is suggested that it is this knowledge rather than physical prowess, that has made Indra the king of gods. This is an important lesson in Hindu polity. Most of the famous Hindu Kings have been great scholars and mystics, even to the present day. This emphasis on knowledge is what distinguishes Hindu society from the others.

The Upaniṣad explained the knowledge of the Absolute in the context of heart-meditation to indicate the importance of this meditation. It ends up by postulating the incantation for this meditation. The aspirant says that he takes shelter in the Divine Being, who sent him from His Divine existence to the body-mind-complex, to experience name and form. Associated with the deep dark colour of the heart, which is ignorance, he cannot perceive it. But at the end of this mortal existence, shaking off all sins, he might reach it by Divine grace. He wants to go to the abode of the Divine Being, meditating upon Him as the most glorious one. He does not want to enter the red, toothless muncher, which though soft and slippery like fresh butter, is the destroyer of fire, strength, vitality, knowledge and virtue.

This knowledge was taught to *Prajāpati* by *Brahmā*. *Prajāpati* in turn taught it to *Manu*. Śaṅkara says that *Brahmā* can mean Śiva in accordance with the other

Upaniṣads, or we may take it as an alternative succession. Manu taught it to men who succeed in attaining it even today. It is to be learnt from a guru, serving him diligently. On entering the family life, one should lead a pure life, dedicatively studying and teaching the knowledge. He should then renounce all, meditate on the Divine Being, practise love towards all beings except where laid down otherwise. Behaving thus he attains the Highest, and returns not to bondage. Or, one may stay in the house for the whole life, but practise meditation as much as possible. Śaṅkara points out that even begging causes other people to be hurt. But since it is allowed, no fault accrues, and this is true for all other stages of life also.

#### CONCLUSION

The Chāndogya-upaniṣad proves to be the most comprehensive treatment of religious metaphysics in all its aspects. That is the very reason why the great Bādarayaṇa has often followed the Chāndogya treatment in his sutras. It has an edge over even the Bṛhadāraṇyaka-upaniṣad because it treats Śiva in both his aspects, viz. the qualified and the unqualified, where as the Bṛhadāraṇyaka is cursory in its treatment of the qualified aspect.

Satyakāma, Uddālaka, Sanatkumāra and Prajāpati shine most brilliantly in the whole galaxy of mysticism. Though the Bṛhadāraṇyaka also presents various stories, the range is wider in the present Upaniṣad. It is specially so because every story throws a different and novel light on the teaching aspect of the Upaniṣad. Though, as in the rest of the Sāmaveda, Prāṇa is eulogised the most, yet the other meditations are dealt with in a thorough manner. Coming as it does, after the religious section of the Sāma Brāhmaṇa, it carries on the discussion in the first chapter along that line, only giving it a turn towards the spiritual meditative side. Since all the recitations of Vaidik hymns start with Aum, the Upaniṣad analyses Aum. It is taken as the symbol of the Highest Divinity. Actually as the first step towards the supreme vision of Śiva, one has to attune oneself to the contemplative experience by first devoting oneself to charity, singing with a devout mind, fervour of spirit, an inmost longing, purity of mind, spending long hours in lonely spots, praying and meditating. One has to learn to direct one's attention continuously with love, without any worldly hankerings, towards the Divine. The soul needs a symbol to fix one's attention, and concentrate one's imagination and reasoning around it. At the end when there is no distraction or disquiet and in complete reposed calm and sweet tranquility Śiva appears in his full glory. Aum (ॐ) is the highest symbol as far as the Vaidik religion goes, and if mysticism is trans-continental, we affirm that it is an universal symbol for no other symbol has enjoyed so much popularity for so long a time by so many varied practitioners and no other symbol has been so thoroughly universalized and rationally interpreted. Being a symbol it can never take the place of Śiva, the symbolized, and thus can never be final. But it covers the Divine Reality with the thinnest veil. It is interesting to note that Buddha, Mahāvīra, Kabīr, Nānak etc. while denying outright

the authority of the Veda, have all stuck to the Aum symbol. It is described as the essence of the universe. It is to be sung, for both Prāṇa and Vāk form a pair with Aum. Furthermore, it makes one assent to all that happens, thus making one accept everything as Śiva's gift.

The Upaniṣad lays down the principle that Śiva is more particular to the intention than action, thus making a wide departure from ritualists who give value only to actions. The departure may be considered historical, as well as psychological. The growth of a child shows that, whatever is the evolutionary history of the species, is reflected in the life of the individual. Thus after representing the symbol, the Upaniṣad lays down the importance of devotion, understanding, insight and faith in it. One must go beyond likes and dislikes to attain perfection is indicated by a marvellous story. Those who cannot meditate on the formless can use the sun etc. as substitutes. There is a beautiful meditation on the words Sā and Am taking all the duals like the sun and the moon, earth and heaven etc. to make the aspirant realize that all duals are two poles of the same magnate. The concept of Śiva as Ardhanārīśvara (अर्धनारीश्वर) seems to be originated here and in such other Vaidik passages.

Next is taken up the question of the ultimate cause of the universe. Rejecting sound, breath, food, water, heaven, and earth, space is posited as the final cause, which in turn is identified with Aum to indicate that the symbol stands for the ultimate cause of the universe. Connected with this the Upaniṣad takes up the issue that not only Aum, but all the rituals are also symbols, and in every case the symbolized (Devatā) must be known for the result of the ritual depends on this. Incidentally Śaṅkara points out that a wrong action is faulty only when it is performed, while the right alternatives are available. If a wise one does a wrong act in distress, no demerit can be attached to him.

After indicating the importance of maintaining the body and even indicating the means to attain the same, some technical meditations connected with the Sāmaveda are enunciated. Sky, rain, seasons, animal, vitality, sun etc. are divided into seven parts and identified with seven words in the Sāma-singing. These are helpful to those who have to spend their time as priests. Thus the Veda lays down that all the activity must be related to the Divine, and It's manifestation. The different chants like Gayatrī, Rathāntara, Vāmadevya, Bṛhat etc. are also similarly made symbols.

Having dealt with specific meditations, life is taken up as a whole, and āśramas assigned specially along with Aum-meditation to point out that this is the best for all. Engaged in one's duties one becomes fit to reach the Goal. On being fit, duties are to be renounced to dedicate oneself wholly to the Divine Will. Until the final realization one must attend to the daily worship, which is laid down, without fail.

The third Brāhmaṇa opens with the Divine Being identified as honey and the Veda as its rays. The gods Vasu, Rudra, Āditya, Marut, Sādhyā etc. also share a part of this honey. Incidentally the Upaniṣad asserts that the sun neither rises nor sets, it

shines just as the Supreme Divinity is always shining. One who identifies himself with the Divine also reaches this stage.

Gāyatrī, the most common prayer is taken up next as the symbol. The Divine self has five doormen. By controlling these, viz. the eye, ear, speech, mind and activity, we are able to breathe the Divine self in the innermost heart. Then one sees visions and hears voices which are messages or land-marks of the explosion of the immortal self into the mortal self. Realization of the whole world as Brahman, already hinted at by saying that it is the ultimate cause, is laid bare in detail. Śāṇḍilya teaches the oneness of individual and universal souls. He informs that the Divine gives rise to all the beings, keeps them alive and eventually takes them back into himself. The journey after death is according to our intentions and actions. The Divine is both immanent and transcendental. To be absorbed in it is the purpose of life. Thus the teaching of Śāṇḍilya is an important landmark in the history of Vedānta. It is interesting to note that a book of devotion is attributed to him.

After establishing the concept of immanence of the Divine, the Upaniṣad goes on to prescribe the whole life as an act of sacrifice. Life is divided into three parts. Vasu, Rudra and Āditya are the ideals to be followed in them respectively. One is bound to live a full life if one follows this way. The sacrifice needs no ceremonials, and can be performed by all castes, creeds, sexes, etc. To indicate the right of the Śūdras in this, a Śūdra, Mahīdāsa, is reported to have been one of those who taught this knowledge. The ritual along with Daharopāsanā is universal. Kṛṣṇa is also associated with this knowledge and it is interesting to note that Gītā emphasizes this teaching. The highest Divinity is seen as a result of this practice.

Mind in the individual and space in the cosmic are to be meditated as the Divine Being. Speech, breath, eye and ear are parts of the mind, and air, sun, fire and directions are parts of sky (space). This meditation is given in detail. Its result is declared as fitness to attain the final knowledge of Śiva and fame in this life.

Again a mystic meditation in the Sun is prescribed, which leads to mystic visions and sounds. Saṁvarga-vidyā (संवर्गविद्या) is taken up next to emphasize the annihilation of all in Śiva. This is illustrated by air. All is annihilated into the air in everyday world. The importance of free food distribution as a vow is associated with this meditation. After emphasizing truth as an ethical code, universal meditation as learnt by Satyakāma is told, followed by Upakosā's realization of the same. This is to emphasize that even in the same tradition, individual tendencies deflect the realization though its spirit remains the same. Hence it is not an identical repetition which would indicate a hypnotic hold of the teacher. It is rather a genuine mystic attainment.

Having thus dealt with different meditations, the fifth Brāhmaṇa starts with analysing the real basis of life as such. By an interesting story it points out the importance of the vital force as the practical basis of life. Food and water are its

sustenance and apparel. Taking mantha ritual as the basis, the Upaniṣad enlarges its significance into ethical life. This leads to the question of the paths which ethical life leads into as compared to mere ritualism, Universal acts are made to represent sacrifices in the five great sacrifices which lead to liberation. Thus we find a constant refrain in the Chāndogya-upaniṣad to convert nature as the symbol of Divine activity in the form of sacrifice and meditation. This finds its fullest manifestation in Vaiśvānara meditation, where the Divine Being is meditated as the sky its head, the sun its eye, air its vitality, space its body, earth its feet, and water its bladder, in the heart of the size of the thumb. Prāṇāgnihotra is another symbolic act of changing a dinner into a sacrifice by feeling that one is eating not merely to satisfy one's hunger but to satisfy the whole cosmos. The idea is that one should share his all with everyone, and work for the good of all. He should eat so that he can serve others. The Upaniṣad goes on to assert that if this spirit is realized then only the other sacrifice bears fruit, not otherwise. Specifically it lays down that realizing the Universal Divine Being as the indweller of all is the goal. Even a Cāṇḍāla is to be served, though tradition considers him as an unworthy person. It ends up with a beautiful analogy that such a realized soul seems like a mother to the whole universe. The world seems to him as his (her) children. Rarely do we come across such beautiful passages in the religious literature of the world.

Having finished both the preparatory meditation of the first Cause, as well as the secondary natural and sacrificial symbols, the Upaniṣad takes up the teaching of the identity of soul with the oversoul. This is the main goal of all spiritual aspirations. This can be realized only by the teachings of the Upaniṣad. First the Being is posited as the non-dual real, denying causality to the non-being. It creates out of its free will all that has come into being. The Upaniṣad asserts creation through the three principles which were later developed by the Sāṃkhya as the three gunas. The shruti shows the way of analysing everything into three main principles. But all this comes out of the free-will of the Divine, the aspect the Sāṃkhya left out. The organic nature of mind and life is also brought out. The mental transcends the vital, but is at the same time rooted in it. Even so, the Being is the ultimate root of the whole universe. The merger of the souls, mind etc. into the Being is asserted to show that if our thoughts are directed to the becoming, we come back, but if directed to the Being, we do not come back. The Being is our real nature. Through illustrations of the ocean and river, flower and honey it is made clear that the differences are merely on the surface, and not in the Being as such. Similarly the seed is posited as the unmanifested tree, to indicate the nature of the Pure Being as the ultimate cause. Again, just as the salt in the water can be known only by the tongue, so also the Being can be perceived in all things only by mentation. By the illustration of the ordeal śruti, warns us that the truth of the Being should never be doubted. Being is not merely to be thought of as a possibility but must be recognised as certainty through reflection, meditation and living in the Being at all times.

After enunciation of the Being by Uddālaka, Sanatkumāra goes on to assert its nature as all pervasive and Bliss. The purpose of the teaching of Uddālaka was to show that knowledge is not complete without knowing the ground of all knowledge. Sanatkumāra's purpose is to show that misery is not annihilated until bliss, which is indifferent from freedom, is realized as the very essence of one's nature. This is established by adhering to the process of Psychological analysis. Through speech, mind, will, thought etc. the analysis is continued until vitality is reached as the essence of the Being. But one must transcend the empirical variety and grasp the metaphysical unity, which is beyond definition and measure. The factual truth is distinguished from the ultimate significance through faith, steadfastness and living the truth in active life. These constitute the secrets of bliss. They are inherently manifested as soon as the abundance of freedom from limitation is experienced. Only when the dualities are totally absent, the infinite, viz. freedom from limitation is realized, for duality always implies limitation. All that is empirical is dual and subject to change. The infinite is rooted in its own greatness, i. e., it is neither great nor bliss because of something else. All else is rooted not in itself, but in others. Joy or freedom is relative in their case.

The Absolute, Self and the Divine Being are identically infinite. This is uttered in a poetical style to show their absolute non-difference. The mystic experience of all that exists ensues from Śiva. This is clearly enunciated in this Upaniṣad. Thus ends one of the greatest lectures in religious history.

Having established the nature of the Divine Being as infinite and bliss, the Upaniṣad goes on to the special meditation and life-style that changes knowledge into wisdom. The world is expressed as the individual writ large. Desires condition the individual. Desires result from ignorance. One who conquers them attains complete sovereignty in all the worlds. Śiva is the bridge which we cross over to the infinite Being. Renunciation of desires is a must for the aspirant.

After eulogising celibacy as the highest sacrifice and austerity, it is clearly laid down that only celibates can attain the highest. Thus devoting oneself entirely to the enquiry and attainment of the Divine Being is necessary for the final mystic experience. Other virtues, practices, duties, religious performances etc. are all secondary. The Upaniṣad ends with repeating the self-knowledge as taught through the analysis of the three states of consciousness. Here Prajāpati teaches it to Indra. The parting advice given is to be attentive to one's station of life, loving meditation of Śiva, and love towards all creatures. These should be practised by one and all. Thus ends one of the greatest texts of Hinduism.

*SWAMI MAHESHANAND GIRI*  
AACHARYA  
Mahamandaleshwar